Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 28, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, March 26, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God and Father of us all, amid all the global concerns which drain our strength and devour our hours, somehow, sometime, somewhere, this week of the passion, may we take time for commerce and communion with the unseen and eternal where in an oasis of quietness there may be restored the inner resources of our pressured lives.

Save us from sweeping through the whole year as if there were no shame upon us, nothing to repent of, nothing richer for us to accept and attain. We confess that the symbols of a contrite spirit such as Thou dost not despise may be very inadequate—our sackcloth may be lined with silk, and our ashes scented with the juice of roses, but let us do something in the healing shadow of the cross that shall break the mere monotony of complacent living. And so, this Holy Week, may the obtrusive secularism which blocks the door of our hearts be pushed back and let the way be cleared, that the highest and best may enter and meet no obstacle. Thus, may we celebrate the singing Easter of the soul. In the risen Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 27, 1956, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Public Lands Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business and take up nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive F, 84th Congress, 2d session: A protocol dated at Montreal, June 14, 1954, relating to certain amendments to the Convention on International Civil Aviation; without reservation (Ex. Rept. No. 4).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Stanley C. Allyn, of Ohio, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 11th session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of T. Keith Glennan, of Ohio, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Thomas M. Healy, of Georgia, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Stephen Sibley Bean, of Maryland, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of R. Lockwood Jones, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Francis Adams Cherry, of Arkansas, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Warren E. Burger, of Minnesota, to be a United States circuit judge for the District of Columbia circuit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Paul C. Weick, of Ohio, to be a United States district judge for the northern district of Ohio.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of C. William Kraft, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be a United States district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, MUNICIPAL COURT OF APPEALS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Leo A. Rover, of the District of Columbia, to be chief judge of the District of Columbia municipal court of appeals.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Philip L. Rice, of Hawaii, to be chief justice of the supreme court, Territory of Hawaii.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Cable A. Wirtz, of Hawaii, to be a judge of the second circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William L. Longshore, of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Alabama.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the United States Public Health Service be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the United States Public Health Service will be considered en bloc, and without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT, RELATING TO LEASEHOLD AND CONSTRUCTION LOANS MADE BY NATIONAL BANKS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act with respect to leasehold and construction loans which may be made by national banks (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SENATE BILL 2410, RELATING TO OPERATIONS OF UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

A letter from the Acting Director, United States Information Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting sundry amendments to the bill (S. 2410) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by amending the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.), now pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON WITHDRAWALS OF PUBLIC LANDS IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to withdrawals of public lands in certain cases (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON RESERVATION OF CERTAIN LANDS WITHIN INDIAN RESERVATIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that during the year 1955, no reservations were made of lands within Indian reservations valuable for power or reservoir sites or necessary for use in connection with irrigation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF COMMISSION FOR CELEBRATION OF 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF JOHN MARSHALL

A letter from the Chairman, United States Commission for the Celebration in 1955 of the 200th Anniversary of the Birth of John Marshall, transmitting, pursuant to law, the final report of that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation revising and extending the water pollution control act

"Whereas there is pending in Congress a bill to revise and extend the expiring Water Pollution Control Act; and

"Whereas the continuance of the benefits provided by this act is essential to the welfare of many of the citizens of this commonwealth; Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation extending the Water Pollution Control Act, incorporating therein the provisions of H. R. 9540 and providing for grants to cities and towns for the elimination of stream pollution and the construction of sewage treatment plants; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from this commonwealth."

Resolutions adopted by the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, Los Angeles, Calif.; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. THURMOND):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memoralizing Congress to institute proceedings to evaluate the Federal fiscal policy and taxing power as it affects the three levels of Government, and to effectuate such evaluation by the calling of a constitutional convention to consider same

"Whereas the people and the General Assembly of South Carolina have voted to increase substantially outlays and taxes in South Carolina for our public schools and other needed projects which it is the exclusive responsibility of the State to provide; and

"Whereas greater sums will be necessary to meet pressing needs; and

"Whereas with the increase and extension of the scope and magnitude of Federal taxation there is a resulting diminution of revenue sources available to the State and a consequent diminution of revenue sources remaining to local governments; and

"Whereas it is obvious that the people of the United States are confronted with a financial crisis, unparalleled in history, with our future form of government turning on the decision as to how to finance these vital State and local functions from State and local revenues as they should be under our form of government; and

"Whereas the time has now come for Congress to face this problem realistically and to recognize that an evaluation must be made of the Federal fiscal policy and taxing power and the effect thereof upon the three levels of Government; and to this end, Congress should initiate such a study by the creation of a joint and representative body which will be vested with the authority and duty to consider and make such recommendations as may be necessary to preserve State sovereignty in this respect, including the consideration of an appropriate constitutional limitation upon the Federal taxing power; and

"Whereas Congress should then effectuate said recommendations either by a calling of a constitutional convention to propose such constitutional amendments as may be deemed necessary or by the proposal of an amendment embodying said recommendations to be submitted to the States for ratification: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*:

"1. That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully petitioned to institute a study of the Federal taxing power and fiscal policy as they affect each level of government, by the creation of a joint and representative body which will include in its consideration the propriety of a constitutional limitation upon the Federal taxing power in order to preserve State sovereignty.

"2. That the findings and recommendations of such a body be effectuated by calling a constitutional convention to propose such

constitutional amendments as may be deemed necessary and appropriate or by the proposing by Congress of an appropriate constitutional amendment for ratification by the States.

"3. That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Senator and Member of Congress from this State."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. 3246. A bill to increase the amount authorized for the erection and equipment of suitable and adequate buildings and facilities for the use of the National Institute of Dental Research (Rept. No. 1719); and

S. 3259. A bill to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instructional material for the blind, to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1720).

Mr. HILL subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 3246), just reported by me, the next time the bill is printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment:

S. 3076. A bill to provide for a continuing survey and special studies of sickness and disability in the United States, and for periodic reports of the results thereof, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1718).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

S. 2851. A bill to transfer certain lands from the Veterans' Administration to the Department of the Interior for the benefit of the Yavapai Indians of Arizona (Rept. No. 1717).

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 3214. A bill to authorize adjustment, in the public interest, of rentals under leases entered into for the provision of commercial recreational facilities at the Clark Hill Reservoir; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1721).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 3541. A bill to eliminate the financial limitation on real and personal estate holdings of the American Historical Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. DUFF):

S. 3542. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of the city of Pittsburgh, Pa.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. PAYNE):

S. 3543. A bill to protect the public in the operation of, and in performance under warranties on, delicate, complicated, sensitive or inherently dangerous machinery, mechanisms or apparatus sold in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENNETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3544. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Sipala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 3545. A bill for the relief of Grace L. Patton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3546. A bill to exempt motor vehicles sold for the use of religious and nonprofit educational institutions from Federal excise tax; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 3547. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 555), authorizing the sale of certain land by the Pueblos of San Lorenzo and Pojoaque; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 3548. A bill to amend section 9 of the Navaho-Hopi Indian Rehabilitation Act to extend the matching formula provided by such section to State plans under the Social Security Act for the permanently and totally disabled and to administrative expenditures under the public-assistance programs under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 3549. A bill to merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for supervision of production credit associations; and for other purposes; and

S. 3550. A bill to merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for supervision of production credit associations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BUSH, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. IVES, Mr. LONG, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 3551. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WELKER (for himself and Mr. DWORSHAK):

S. 3552. A bill for the relief of certain alien sheepherders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 3553. A bill to extend the time for initiating and pursuing programs of institutional on-farm training under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952; to the Committee on Labor and Pubilc Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

ELIMINATION OF LIMITATION ON CERTAIN HOLDINGS OF AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to eliminate the financial limitation on real and personal estate holdings of the American Historical Association.

The American Historical Association is a nonprofit, learned society for the promotion, in the charter's words, "of historical studies, the collection and preservation of historical manuscripts, and for kindred purposes in the interest of American history, and of history in America." Since its founding in 1884 it has steadfastly pursued these objectives.

Because membership in the association has increased from 287 in 1885 to 6,500 today, its activities as an association and the value of its assets have increased substantially. As a result, it has become necessary to have the original act of incorporation amended in order to meet present circumstances.

The association asks therefore that its charter be changed by elimination of the financial limitation of $500,000 now imposed upon it. This seems to me a valid and proper request. Senator Hoar of Massachusetts filed the original bill authorizing incorporation of this association. It is for this reason as well that I am pleased to introduce this bill at the present time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3541) to eliminate the financial limitation on real and personal estate holdings of the American Historical Association, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SPECIAL SERIES OF POSTAGE STAMPS TO COMMEMORATE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF CITY OF PITTSBURGH, PA.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative stamp to celebrate the founding of the city of Pittsburgh.

November 27, 1958, will mark the 200th anniversary of the naming of the city. While this is 2 years ahead of us, a committee of public and private citizens has been organized to work out plans to honor this occasion. It is one hope that the Postmaster General will have sufficient time to schedule and prepare a stamp of suitable design. It will mean a great deal to the people of Pittsburgh.

The history of this great city is closely interwoven with the development of our life as a nation. In fact, it was a young Virginia militia officer named George Washington who first selected the site where the Monongahela and Allegheny Rivers meet at Pittsburgh to form the mighty Ohio as the location for a fort.

The French got there first and built Fort Duquesne. It was the British general, John Forbes, who later wrested the area from the French and named his new fortification Fort Pitt. Pittsburgh dates its founding from that day—November 27, 1758—General Forbes addressed a letter to the English Prime Minister Pitt, telling him that the city-to-be was named in his honor—Pittsburgh.

Since that time, the name of Pittsburgh has become a synonym for industry. It became the arsenal of the Union during the Civil War and carried that title to unprecedented heights during subsequent wars. It has been settled by English, Scotch, Irish, and people from practically every country of central and southern Europe. It has given birth to religious and political movements which have swayed the history of the Nation.

The people of Pittsburgh are justly proud of their city, which today has emerged from the smoke of history, and is building to newer and greater accomplishments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3542) to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., introduced by Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. DUFF), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SALE AND DISTRIBUTION OF AUTOMOBILES

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], I introduce a bill, send it to the desk, and request its appropriate reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3543) to protect the public in the operation of, and in performance under warranties on, delicate, complicated, sensitive, or inherently dangerous machinery, mechanisms or apparatus sold in interstate commerce, introduced by Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. PAYNE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I now send to the desk an explanation of the bill, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, along with the text of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes to explain the purpose of the bill I have just introduced.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Utah may proceed.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, having been active in the retail automobile business, I have long been searching for a means, within the limits of existing law, of solving the "automobile bootlegging" problem. The bill I have just introduced contains such a solution.

This plan is based on two premises: first, that the interest of the consuming public is much more important than that of the manufacturers and the dealers; second, that in America today we have an essentially new commercial pattern, created because of the many products of a mechanical and electrical nature, which are purchased and operated by relatively unskilled persons, who need the protection of manufacturers' warranties, and also require that service be conveniently available during the entire useful life of the product. The bill recognizes that this responsibility to furnish service is shared by both the manufacturer and the dealer, and that, therefore, they can properly enter into an agreement recognizing this function, for which the manufacturer can properly compensate the franchised dealer who maintains the facilities and supplies the services required. Under this reasoning, it follows that the dealer's compensation can be divided between that for his selling function and that for his service function, thus reducing the potential profit to dealers who provide only the selling function. It is believed that the net effect of this arrangement will be to dry up the bootlegging evil under economic, rather than legal, pressure.

The bill suggests other features which might be introduced into such an agreement, including one under which the manufacturer could accept responsibility for the retail advertising of his product when sold as new. The bill also provides that the terms and conditions of any agreement arrived at pursuant to its provisions must be filed with the Federal Trade Commission, which, in the bill, is given power to modify any agreement if it is found to be contrary to the provisions of the bill.

I have discussed this bill with a number of persons in the industry, both manufacturers and dealers. They have indicated interest, although not complete agreement.

I am sending a copy of the bill and a more complete explanation of its contents to every Member of the Senate. Therefore, I ask that the bill be allowed to lie at the desk for 4 days after the close of the Easter recess, in order that any Senator who is interested may join me in sponsoring the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXHIBIT A

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENNETT

Having been active in a retail automobile dealership before I came to the Senate, I have been searching for a proposal which might help to correct the conditions revealed by the current Senate hearings on manufacturer-dealer relationships in the automobile industry. I realize that to be effective, such a program must provide relief without doing violence to our existing law for the protection of free competition and the prevention of restraint of trade. Today I am introducing a bill for myself and the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], which I hope will help meet this situation. I ask that it be allowed to lie on the table until 4 days after the close of the Easter recess, during which any of my colleagues who may choose to do so may join in sponsoring it, and that thereafter it be appropriately referred.

In seeking a solution for these problems, I have found it helpful to refocus my thinking and approach them from a point of view that I feel is important in two respects:

First, instead of concentrating directly on the manufacturer-dealer relationship itself, I have sought to approach the problems from the point of view of the needs and interests of the consumers. That they have a much greater stake in its solution is indicated by the fact that there are millions of Americans who own and drive more than 60 million cars and trucks. My approach to the problems, then, is to develop a program through which the manufacturers and dealers can develop a pattern of relationships with the consumers' interests as its chief objective, thus substituting an attitude of shared responsibility for a less desirable relationship.

Second, we need to consider the new business pattern that is developing because ours is essentially an electrical age. This new commercial pattern grows out of the fact that there are millions of comparatively new devices which are delicate, sensitive, complicated—yes, and sometimes even inherently dangerous. These products are growing in variety and complexity each year and are bound to continue to increase in number. They are not limited to automobiles and trucks. They also include such things as radios and television sets, ranges and refrigerators, heating and air conditioning equipment with all its automatic controls, computing and recording devices, and agricultural implements and methods. All of these products have two things in common. First, they are purchased and operated by relatively untrained consumers; second, most of them are purchased from independent dealers on whom the purchasers must rely for service as well as sales. In fact, as product complexity increases and the span of its usefulness lengthens, these service functions become infinitely more important and impose a new kind of continuing business responsibility on both the manufacturer and the dealer.

That such service problems exist and that they must be provided for has long been recognized by many industries, including the automotive industry. The manufacturer usually ackoledged his responsibility by providing a limited warranty on his product and by requiring his franchised dealers to set up and maintain extensive service facilities manned by trained men. In the case of the automotive industry, these dealer service facilities carry a double burden. The manufacturer uses them to satisfy customer claims under the warranty, and the customer himself uses them to service the product long after the warranty period has expired—out to the very end of the product's useful life.

My bill, then, is based on the recognition of these two things: (a) the overriding interest of the consumer public and (b) the existence of this comparatively new business pattern involving service after the sale. The chief purpose of my bill, then, is to set up conditions under which the shared responsibilities of manufacturer and dealer can be expressed in a franchise agreement. While it is specifically designed to serve the needs of the automobile industry, I think the bill is broad enough to cover most, if not all, mechanical or electrical products.

The chief purpose of the bill is to set forth the area that may be covered by an agreement whose purpose is to protect the public in the operation of and in performance under warranties on delicate, complicated, sensitive, or inherently dangerous machines, mechanisms, or apparatus sold in interstate commerce. Its chief concern is with an agreement to protect the service function. Such an agreement shall set forth the minimum consumer service functions which the dealer shall be required to maintain, both to fulfill the manufacturer's warranty and to provide service for the full useful life of the product; and the agreement shall state the mutual obligations of the parties in carrying out their warranty and service responsibilities. Such a franchised dealer who has provided the required minimum consumer service facilities could also be appointed as an agent of the manufacturer to accept applications for the manufacturer's warranty from the consumer, to issue such warranty, and to perform the work required by any claims under the warranty. If the franchised dealer met these requirements, the manufacturer could include in the agreement a plan by which he could compensate the franchised dealer for his services. This

compensation could be paid in cash or by allowances or could be expressed as a portion of the trade discount or markup. Of course, the conditions for such payment would have to be identical for each francised dealer performing a like service.

The compensation in this case is conceived as functional and the conditions on which the dealer could qualify and the manner of computing the amounts involved would properly be part of the agreement and left to the judgment of the agreeing parties.

Because questions of truth in advertising have been raised, the bill, as an additional precaution, would permit the manufacturer under the agreement to assume control of and responsibility for all advertising of his product when offered for sale by the dealer as a new rather than used or secondhand product.

The chief approach of the bill is permissive, but it does provide that if a manufacturer and dealer enter into such an agreement, the agreement must contain all the terms and conditions of the contract. It also contains a prohibition against including in any agreement anything with respect to resale prices or terms, and it would require that the agreement be filed with the Federal Trade Commission which could, after notice and hearing, suspend, nullify, or modify any provisions thereof.

The effectiveness of the bill in providing the local dealer protection from bootlegging is based on the idea that it would drastically reduce the bootleggers' profit and thus dry up this source of trouble.

After checking the proposed language of the bill with legal counsel well versed in the application of existing antitrust laws, I have been given the opinion that this proposal will not violate any existing laws. Most of the known proposals to give territorial security to dealers have been attacked under the antitrust laws as inconsistent with a merchant's freedom to resell goods to whomever he may choose on his own terms. Section 1 of the Sherman Act prohibits any agreement between a manufacturer and a dealer which limits the dealer in his resales of automobiles to consumers residing or working within a limited geographical area is a restriction on his freedom to engage in commerce. Similarly, an agreement, requiring a dealer to pay a penalty to another dealer for selling an automobile to a consumer residing in the other dealer's geographical territory, is a restraint on the seller's freedom to engage in commerce. An agreement by a dealer not to resell to bootleggers would be a restraint on his freedom to resell to customers of his own choice.

The proposed bill does not run afoul of any of these prohibitions. The manufacturer is unrestricted in the dealers whom it may franchise as its franchised dealers. The bill does not require manufacturers to sell only to franchised dealers, although presumably manufacturers might choose to do so. Existing law gives a manufacturer the right to choose its customers, and currently manufacturers decline to issue franchises to dealers who do not possess minimum sales and service facilities.

The proposed bill does not restrict the dealer in the resale of automobiles. Any dealer may resell any automobile to any person at any price he may choose. Similarly, a consumer is free to purchase an automobile from any dealer in any area he may select.

In many respects, this bill stays clearly within existing law. No law requires a manufacturer to issue an express warranty, and implied warranties apply only to the condition of the goods at the time of sale. For reasons of their own choice, automobile manufacturers elect to give certain warranties to consumers.

The discount that automobile manufacturers grant dealers from list price is a functional discount. It compensates the dealer for several functions which he performs in the distribution of the product, only one of which is making the sale to the consumer. Dealers certainly may also agree to maintain certain service and repair facilities and to perform the warranty obligations of the manufacturer. A dealer for a particular car is generally already expected to perform the warranty obligation of the manufacturer on any automobile of that brand, no matter where it was purchased or where the buyer resides.

No law stipulates the amount of functional discount which the manufacturer must allow the dealer. This is a matter of negotiation between the seller and buyer, subject only to the restrictions of the Robinson-Patman Act against price discrimination.

No existing law prohibits a manufacturer from appointing an agent for the purpose of issuing its warranty to the consumer. Inherently, the manufacturer would want that agent to have knowledge concerning the character and operation of the product in order that he might make certain that the product was in a condition suitable for warranty at the time the warranty was issued. The manufacturer might wish to know that nothing had been done to the product, from the time it left the manufacturer's hands until it was delivered to the consumer, that might affect the liability of the manufacturer under the warranty.

In terms of automobiles, there is no prohibition under existing law to prevent a manufacturer from selecting certain dealers to issue warranties on its behalf, certainly no objection to authorizing all of its franchised dealers to do so. Since this is one of the functions the dealer performs in earning his functional discount, it would be appropriate to separate the compensation to be paid dealers for that purpose, from the functional discount they earn in other respects.

Furthermore, the automobile manufacturer has the right to choose its own customers and cannot be said to discriminate in price unless it charges different prices to competing customers.

The proposed bill contemplates that the automobile manufacturer would charge a nondiscriminatory price to its automobile dealers (presumably uniform to all dealers except for variations in freight charges); that each dealer would be free to resell his automobiles to any person in any area at any price he might choose; and the ultimate purchaser would be free to apply to any authorized dealer of the manufacturer for the manufacturer's warranty. Certainly, it cannot be contended that a manufacturer can be required to permit unauthorized persons to inspect vehicles on its behalf preparatory to issuing warranties, much less than such unauthorized persons could commit the manufacturer by a warranty.

It is, therefore, apparent that the course of conduct contemplated by this bill is permissible under existing antitrust laws and is not contrary to any of their provisions.

The bill further permits manufacturers to supervise and regulate the advertising of their dealers on new automobiles; and it would make the manufacturer liable for any false and misleading advertising of the dealer within its power to prevent. There is no existing prohibition against a contract between a manufacturer and a dealer under which the dealer agrees to use the manufacturer's trade name or trademark only in advertising previously approved by the owner of the trade name or trademark. In fact, the owner of the trade name or trademark may prohibit all advertising using its trade name or trademark. To the extent that the bill may be said to go beyond existing law in this area, it is only that it would make the manufacturer responsible for the advertising of the dealer which it could control, and it is not unlikely that under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act that it is already liable for false and misleading advertising which it has approved expressly or by implication.

The only additional provisions of the bill provide for filing of contracts with the Federal Trade Commission and granting the Commission authority to enforce the purposes of the bill. To the extent that this may be said to go beyond existing statutory authorization, it would do no more than to authorize the Federal Trade Commission to protect the consuming public with respect to matters which the manufacturer and the dealer are already free to agree.

The purpose of the bill, then, is not so much to make new law with respect to the relationship between manufacturers and their service dealers as to focus attention on the existence of a functional service relationship which can be used as the basis for a manufacturer-dealer agreement under existing law, the practical effects of which would be to reduce the potential profit from bootlegging and thus tend to dry up this evil under economic rather than legal pressure. I commend the study of this approach to the committees concerned and to all of my colleagues in the Senate.

S. 3543

A bill to protect the public in the operation of, and in performance under warranties on, delicate, complicated, sensitive or inherently dangerous machinery, mechanisms or apparatus sold in interstate commerce

Whereas the American public annually purchase, in interstate commerce, many billions of dollars of delicate, complicated, sensitive, and sometimes inherently dangerous machines or mechanisms, such as electronic, refrigeration and heating equipment, computing and recording devices, automobiles, trucks, agricultural implements, and other manufactured products, from independent dealers on whom purchasers rely as the manufacturer's sales and service representatives; and

Whereas dealers in, and manufacturers of, such machines and mechanisms have a joint responsibility to the consumer for performance under the warranty issued in connection with the sale of any such machine, and for maintaining facilities to assure the availability of service throughout the useful life of such machine, which responsibility can neither be separated nor performed adequately by either without the cooperation of the other.

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the Interstate Machine Sales Act of 1956.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this act:

(a) "Commerce" shall have the meaning given the term in the act of September 26, 1914 (15 U. S. C. 45).

(b) "Person" shall mean any individual, partnership, firm, or corporation.

(c) "Commission" shall mean the Federal Trade Commission created by the Act of September 26, 1914 (15 U. S. C. 45).

(d) "Product" shall mean any manufactured, fabricated, or assembled delicate, complicated, sensitive, or inherently dangerous machine, mechanism, or apparatus such as, but not limited to, electronic, refrigeration, or heating equipment, computing or recording devices, automobiles, trucks, agricultural implements, and like manufactured goods.

(e) "Franchised dealer" shall mean any distributor of a product manufactured by a "manufacturer," pursuant to a "dealer agreement" filed with the Commission pursuant to this act.

(f) "Manufacturer" shall mean any person engaged in commerce who manufactures or assembles a product sold or distributed to consumers under its own trade name or trade names.

(g) "Dealer agreement" shall mean a written contract or agreement between a manufacturer and a franchised dealer entered into pursuant to the provisions of this act and the form of which is filed with the Commission as herein provided.

(h) "Consumer" shall mean any person purchasing a product for his or its own personal, domestic, or commercial use, and which he or it registers in his or its own name whenever State law requires registration, and not a person purchasing for resale for profit.

(i) "Consumer service facilities" shall mean the physical property, mechanized equipment, trained personnel, and stocks of new and replacement parts and accessories necessary to furnish consumers with an opportunity for demonstration and visual inspection of the product, and to adequately service and repair such product both before and after its delivery to the consumer.

SEC. 3. The purposes of this act are (a) to protect the consuming public in performance under the warranty issued on a purchased product, (b) to insure the continued availability to the public of adequate consumer service facilities, and (c) to preserve the availability of adequate consumer service facilities to consumers, from the thousands of small-business men dealers of such products, both during the period of the warranty and thereafter during the useful life of the product.

SEC. 4. A manufacturer (or his representative) and a franchised dealer may enter into a dealer agreement pursuant to this act, and any such agreement:

(a) Shall provide that it is entered into pursuant to the provisions of this act and is subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission as provided for in section 7 of this act.

(b) Shall contain all of the terms and conditions of the agreement between the parties, shall state the minimum consumer service facilities required to be maintained by the dealer in order that he can perform the warranty issued to the consumer and achieve the other purposes of this act both during and after the warranty period, shall state the mutual obligations of the parties between themselves in compliance with their joint warranty and service responsibility to the consumer, and may contain such reasonable provisions as are required adequately to protect the manufacturer's good will in the sale, servicing, and advertising of his product by the franchised dealer.

(c) May provide for the appointment of franchised dealers of the manufacturer as its agents to accept from any consumer an application for, and to issue, a warranty on a trade-named product of the manufacturer and may establish or stipulate that portion of the dealer discount or markup (stated either in terms of a sum of money or as a proration of a trade discount or markup) representing the value of the franchised dealer's function in issuing and fulfilling such warranty and in having available appropriate consumer service facilities to service such product thereafter during its useful life, if called upon to do so by the consumer.

(i) The means, times and methods by which the manufacturer may make payments to franchised dealers, of the agreed value of issuing the warranty and maintaining consumer service facilities, may be such as are agreed upon by the manufacturer and the franchised dealers; provided, however, that the terms and conditions of such payments shall be identical for each franchised dealer, of any trade-named product of any manufacturer, performing like services.

(ii) The agreement shall provide the terms and conditions on which the warranty may be issued; provided, however, that nothing herein contained shall permit any restriction on the consumer in his free choice of the vendor from whom he may purchase a product, or to whom he may thereafter take such product for service, or of the franchised dealer he may select to fulfill the obligations of the warranty.

(d) Shall make no provision, express or implied, with respect to resale prices or resale terms or conditions of any product.

SEC. 5. A dealer agreement entered into pursuant to this act may also provide that all advertising by a franchised dealer for products, which use the manufacturer's brand or trade name (except when such products are offered for sale as used or secondhand), shall be (i) copy furnished or approved by the manufacturer, or (ii) copy and layout similar to that previously furnished or approved by the manufacturer (and unlike any copy ever disapproved by the manufacturer), and (iii) copy that is not false, misleading or deceptive.

If a manufacturer elects to enter into an agreement that contains provisions provided for in paragraph 5 above, it shall be legally responsible for advertising of its products (except when such products are offered for sale as used or secondhand) by a franchised dealer which is false, misleading or deceptive and which it could have prevented by reasonable utilization of the contractual commitments permitted by paragraph 5 above.

SEC. 6. Every manufacturer electing to enter into dealer agreements pursuant to this act shall file with the Commission, not later than 10 days after entering into any such agreement, a copy of the form of such agreement. Such form need not contain the name or address of the franchised dealer, the terminal date of the particular agreement, the number of products to be purchased by the particular dealer, or similar information of a numerical nature varying with different dealers and not expressly provided for by this act. When the same form is used by the manufacturer with more than 1 franchised dealer, it may file only 1 such form with the Commission.

(a) The Commission may, after notice and hearing, suspend, nullify, or modify any provision of any such dealer agreement which it finds contrary to the provisions and purposes of this act. Any proceeding hereunder by the Commission shall conform to the procedures and practices described in the Administrative Procedures Act, except that notice of hearing may be given merely by 60 days' advance publication in the Federal Register. Any party adversely affected by any final order or ruling of the Commission made pursuant to this section shall be entitled to a review thereof in the manner provided in section 11 of the act of October 15, 1914 (15 U. S. C. 22). No order of the Commission entered under this section shall have any retroactive effect.

SEC. 7. It shall be an unfair method of competition, in violation of any subject to the proceeding under section 5 of the act of September 26, 1914 (Federal Trade Commission Act; 15 U. S. C. 45), for any person to violate a provision of this act.

FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN PROTECTION OF SHORES OF PUBLICLY OWNED PROPERTY

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of 14 other Senators and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the act of 1946 authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting one of the Nation's great natural assets, our shorelines.

I have been joined in this effort to overcome the beach erosion problem by the following colleagues: Senators BENDER, BRICKER, BUSH, EASTLAND, ERVIN, GEORGE, IVES, LONG, PAYNE, SALTONSTALL, SCOTT, SMITH of Maine, SMITH of New Jersey, and KENNEDY.

Under existing law, the Federal Government has limited authority to deal with wave and storm damage to our beaches. The Beach Erosion Board of the Army Corps of Engineers has entered into cooperative study agreements with 22 States. And, with the Federal share at one-third of project cost and with the State and local share at two-thirds, the Army engineers currently are involved in protection projects where publicly owned beach is involved.

Mr. President, we have not yet gained the mastery in the struggle to protect our shoreline from erosion by our lakes and seas. I believe that we cannot solve the problem by building protective works only where the shore is public property and ignoring adjoining areas which are privately owned. The processes of erosion cannot read signs. We cannot be truly effective by building groins, seawalls, and jetties here and there, without a comprehensive plan.

The need for expanding our present authority for dealing with beach erosion at the Federal level has been developed in the House, thanks, in great part, to the legislative efforts of Representative JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, Republican, of New Jersey. The work he and several of his colleagues from various sections of the country are doing on new approaches to this problem has sparked the introduction of this bill.

The legislation we are introducing in the Senate today would not change present law affecting use of Federal funds for protection of public property. It would extend existing authority to private shore protection with the same ratio of Federal and State-local contributions embodied in Public Law 727.

In considering the merits of our bill, it should be remembered that in the case of flood-control projects, the Federal Government normally pays all the costs without regard to public or private ownership. The same theory applies to other engineering projects undertaken by the Army engineers. In addition, pending bills establishing hurricane and flood insurance programs make no differentiation between public and private property.

Mr. President, an extensive screening process would be involved, if this legislation is enacted, before individual beach erosion projects would be finally approved.

There are many safeguards against abuse incorporated in our bill. First, the Beach Erosion Board must agree with the State that a project is sound and economically justified. Moreover, the State or political subdivision must agree to keep up the project once completed.

Mr. President, this bill means flexibility in operation and assurance that the job can be adequately done under a cooperative partnership, with the Federal Government joining in dealing effectively with the problem for the first time.

Under a cooperative study agreement with our own State, the Army engineers have been surveying a major portion of the New Jersey coastline. The Engineers' initial recommendations cover an area of approximately 100 miles. The cost of improvement and rehabilitation is estimated at about $24 million.

Under existing law, the Federal share would reach about $3 million. The State or its subdivisions would be responsible for the other $21 million.

Under this bill, the Federal share would become $8 million. Under this bill such work and similar projects in other States could be accomplished. Moreover, there is continuity to the recommendations of the Army engineers. Private and public shores would not be segregated, some areas to be protected and improved while the rest are ignored.

Mr. President, I commend this bill to the Senate as a sensible and logical extension of Federal interest in a natural resource and a source of recreation of incalculable value to the American people.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3551) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. SCOTT) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, some time ago, on behalf of the senior Senator from Georgia and myself, I submitted an amendment to H. R. 7225, for the purpose of increasing Federal matching funds to State public welfare programs for old-age assistance.

On February 24 I had the privilege of submitting, on behalf of 46 Senators, our amendment to the social security bill. Other Senators were offered the opportunity to join in sponsoring this amendment after it had been modified to include a provision to assure that the increased Federal funds would be passed along to the needy aged. Many of our colleagues responded enthusiastically.

I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to two of the proposals made on March 6 by the very able senior Senator from Washington. These proposals, submitted as amendments to the amendment I had the honor of sending to the desk February 24, would apply the same matching formula—that is, a Federal payment of five-sixths of the first $30, plus one-half up to $65—to our State programs for aid to the blind and aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

I wish to commend the Senator from Washington for his prompt action in this matter, and to state my own belief that the more adequate formula should be applied to the needy blind and needy disabled programs as well as to the old-age assistance program. I had originally considered including provisions for these changes in the amendment which I introduced. However, I decided to delay including the blind and disabled programs until figures became available regarding the cost to the Federal Government, and until I could better ascertain the sentiments of other Senators in this regard.

A tabulation showing the effect of changing the formulas for the other two programs for each State is now available. The total cost to the Federal Government would be $23,435,000 annually. I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Long amendments to H. R. 7225:[1] Aid to the blind and aid to the permanently and totally disabled—Estimated annual increase in Federal funds under assumption II,[2] includes vendor payments for medical care

[Based on data for September 1955. Excludes Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands]

State	Annual increase in Federal funds under assumption II [2] (in thousands)	
	Aid to the blind	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled
Total	$6,960	$16,475
Alabama	98	653
Alaska	6	----------
Arizona	65	----------
Arkansas	123	300
California	1,105	----------
Colorado	$27	$411
Connecticut	30	178
Delaware	19	23
District of Columbia	22	189
Florida	169	9
Georgia	204	637
Hawaii	9	109
Idaho	16	71
Illinois	305	544
Indiana	143	----------
Iowa	125	----------
Kansas	52	281
Kentucky	180	----------
Louisiana	160	937
Maine	45	23
Maryland	38	395
Massachusetts	162	901
Michigan	154	206
Minnesota	107	71
Mississippi	222	190
Missouri	329	794
Montana	38	120
Nebraska	67	----------
Nevada	11	----------
New Hampshire	24	22
New Jersey	77	305
New Mexico	26	110
New York	377	3,506
North Carolina	294	703
North Dakota	9	73
Ohio	320	526
Oklahoma	176	483
Oregon	29	277
Pennsylvania	525	1,040
Rhode Island	15	135
South Carolina	106	486
South Dakota	12	42
Tennessee	196	97
Texas	391	----------
Utah	20	151
Vermont	9	29
Virginia	84	311
Washington	68	482
West Virginia	70	517
Wisconsin	95	99
Wyoming	6	39

[1] Federal funds shall equal 5/6 of the first $30 on the average per recipient plus ½ of the balance within a maximum of $65 on the individual payment per recipient.

[2] Assuming the States spend as much per recipient from State and local funds as they spent in September 1955.

Mr. LONG. My view, Mr. President, that the application of these changes to the two additional programs would be highly desirable, is shared by other Senators who joined as cosponsors of the February 24 amendment. In view of this, and in view of the desirability of having a "clean" amendment for consideration by the Finance Committee, I submit a revised amendment containing provisions applying the new formula to aid to the blind and aid to the disabled. It is submitted on behalf of myself, the other Senators who joined in the February 24 amendment, and on behalf of Senators MONRONEY and PURTELL, who also desire to associate with these proposals.

The revised amendment contains an additional change of a technical nature. I have been attempting to perfect a pass-along proviso which would insure that States actually spend the increased funds for payments to recipients. The additional change would make the pass-along provision applicable for only 1 year, in order that the States could make allowance for the increasing number of aged persons who in the future will receive small payments under old-age and survivors insurance. A State could permanently qualify for the more liberal formula by maintaining for 1 year its average payment per recipient from State funds.

It is my earnest hope that the Congress will favorably act on these proposals during this session in order to bring a modest measure of relief to our neediest citizens.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate what the Senator is doing. Now that we have the figures, I think we can all come to an agreement that these two categories of our people should be included.

Mr. LONG. I agree with the Senator and appreciate his realization of the situation and bringing it to the attention of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and printed.

The amendment, submitted by Mr. LONG (for himself, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERR, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. YOUNG), was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to the bill, H. R. 7225, to amend the Social Security Act, which would increase the present unrealistic minimum benefit payment under old-age and survivors insurance from $30 to $55 monthly. Senators may recall that I proposed an amendment to the social-security bill of 1954, requiring the

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to study the problems involved in increasing the minimum payment. Although the Department recommends against my proposal, this study has been made and has been carefully examined in connection with the amendment I am now proposing.

I believe the time has come for the Congress to give serious consideration to the adequacies of minimum benefits under social security. We should give more recognition to the role of the aged in our economic life, and take into account the increased productivity of this Nation insofar as the benefits payable to those who earned social security coverage during the depression years are concerned.

About 40 percent of our 4.5 million retired workers drawing social security receive less than $55 per month; and a much higher percentage of the 2 million secondary beneficiaries receive less than $55.

For many of these individuals, the social-security check is the only source of income. I do not believe that it is reasonable to expect anyone to exist on $30 a month today.

It is estimated that if the $55 minimum were adopted 400,000 cases presently on old-age public assistance could be closed or reduced immediately, and by 1960 over 650,000 could be closed or reduced. For the country as a whole, this would reduce the expenditure for old-age assistance by $73 million immediately and by $116 million in 1960.

Furthermore, the administration's study estimates that of the present full-time male labor force covered by social security, based on 1954 wages, only 1.6 percent would qualify for less than $55 monthly when retirement age is reached. The time is thus approaching when most workers will receive at least $55 upon retirement age without changes in the law. However, it is neither necessary nor desirable to ignore the minimum needs of those already retired, nor to insist, during this interim period that they go on the public welfare rolls.

Without any further increases in payroll tax, a minimum benefit of $55 monthly could be paid, and the trust fund of the old-age and survivors' insurance program would continue to increase at the following rates, according to the administration study:

Trust fund short-range estimates

Year:	*Billions*
1955 (present law)	$21.6
1957 ($55 minimum)	22.4
1958 ($55 minimum)	22.9
1959 ($55 minimum)	23.2
1960 ($55 minimum)	25.2

The administration study was requested on alternative minimum benefits of $55, $60, and $75 per month. The following table indicates the increased benefits which would be payable at each of these levels:

[Millions]

Year	Increased disbursements		
	$55	$60	$75
1956	$591	$800	$651
1957	601	816	1,744
1958	600	814	1,746
1959	590	800	1,727
1960	571	775	1,685

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and printed.

REORGANIZATION OF SAFETY FUNCTIONS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 23, 1956,

The name of Mr. SPARKMAN was added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 3517) to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators) on March 23, 1956.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Easter address by Senator WILEY; and editorial entitled "The Light Shineth in Darkness," published in the Ripon (Wis.) Press of March 23, 1956.

TITLES TO CERTAIN LAND AND REAL PROPERTY—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent that the committee be discharged from further consideration of the following bills and that they be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2581, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to quitclaim all interest of the United States in certain land located in Forrest County, Miss., in order to clear the title to such land; and

S. 1523, to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the city of Pensacola, Fla.

The request which has been made is agreeable to the sponsors of each of the mentioned bills as well as the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Both of these bills are in the same category as other "color of title" claims which are now pending before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COMMENDATION OF TREASURY DEPARTMENT FOR SEIZURE OF DAILY WORKER AND COMMUNIST PARTY OFFICES; AND RECOMMENDATION OF FURTHER LEGAL ATTACK ON TAX FRONT AGAINST THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to commend the Treasury Department for its action yesterday in seizing and padlocking the premises of the Daily Worker, as well as those of the Communist Party in New York and its branches across the country, on the ground of failure to pay back income taxes and penalties for the years 1951, 1952, and 1953. In my judgment, such action—strong, but perfectly legal and proper—is long overdue.

I should like to point out that almost a year ago—on April 20, 1955—I pointed out on the Senate floor how, for a period of months preceding that date, I had been urging the then Commissioner of Internal Revenue, T. Coleman Andrews, to launch a "tax blitz" against the Communist Party and its affiliates. On February 25, 1955, I wrote to Commissioner Andrews, pointing out, for example, that a New York State joint legislative committee had conclusively proven that only three Communist Party front organizations—the Civil Rights Congress, the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, and the so-called Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee—had, among themselves, raised a total of $3½ million. What about all the other millions of dollars raised by the party and its fronts, I asked. What do the tax returns on these millions of dollars show or fail to show, I inquired. I stated that it was essential to place "under the miscroscope" the finances of the entire Communist and satellite system in our country. I urged vigorous analysis of the tax returns of the wealthy Communist-liners who have defrayed party expenses, the "business agents" who have reportedly invested huge Red sums in private enterprises on behalf of the party, and so forth.

This morning, I wrote an open letter to Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey, urging further investigative action along this line.

I send to the desk the text of my letter to Secretary Humphrey. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the text of my remarks published in the April 20, 1955, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 4, pages 4783–4785, be reprinted in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 28, 1956.

Hon. GEORGE M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury,
United States Department of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am pleased to note the action of the Treasury Department in directing the Internal Revenue agents to seize Communist Party, as well as Daily Worker, offices because of nonpayment of back income taxes and penalties.

We can, of course, anticipate that a counterattack of criticism on the basis of alleged infringement of the press which has already been launched will be intensified on the part of the Communist Party.

We may also expect further criticism on the part of some otherwise well-meaning individuals, of proven loyalty, who may misguidedly assume that the Treasury Department's action may have been a violation of the first amendment.

In my judgment, as a lawyer, and as senior Republican on the Senate Judiciary Committee, based on facts which have become available thus far, it would appear that the Department was entirely within its legal rights in taking this action on the basis of the levy issued by the district director of internal revenue.

The Daily Worker and the Communist Party will, of course, have their day in court,

as is their right. They will have the fullest opportunity, in accordance with due process of law, to present their case.

As you know so well, however, they are not entitled to anything more than the law allows. And the whole outrageous history of the Communist Party, from its brazen bail-jumping officers to the many other Smith Act convictions against it, confirms the wisdom of the Treasury Department in not treating the present case as if it involves people and organizations of good faith. If it did involve such ordinary citizens, the Department might well have proceeded in a different pace and manner. But, instead, the Department was perfectly sound in acting decisively and speedily in delivering this hard-hitting legal blow.

In my judgment, the action yesterday should, however, be but the first element in an all-out blitz against the party. I believe—as I wrote to you and Commissioner Andrews last year—that a special section might well be set up in the Internal Revenue Service—a section of lawyers, CPA's, and others—specializing in the tax returns of the Communist conspiracy in our midst. Such a nationwide unit should function in collaboration with the Federal Bureau of Investigation in ferreting out every possible lead on Communist and satellite tax returns and in cracking down on every error of omission or commission.

This Nation well remembers that it was conviction for income-tax violations which finally put Al Capone in the penitentiary and which broke the back of other leading criminals in our country.

There is no reason why the same cannot be done against the Communist Party. Its whole financial basis is a vast web of sinister mystery whose exposure could well prove decisive. In my judgment, there is no point in treating Red tax returns in an ordinary or routine way.

I look forward to hearing from you on the effective followup of yesterday's action.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 20, 1955, pp. 4783–4785]

CRACKING DOWN ON COMMUNISTS' TAX RETURNS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been deeply interested for some time in making sure that the fullest investigative scrutiny of the United States Internal Revenue Service is directed at the Communist conspiracy in our Nation.

In my judgment, the tax investigative power offers a vital weapon which should not be ignored or underused in the all-out battle against the law-breaking Communist network in our land.

I send to the desk a statement and attachments on this subject, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

" 'Will the United States Government use its fullest powers to investigate tax returns in combating communism in our midst?'

"This is a question which I have raised on several occasions with the Honorable T. Coleman Andrews, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and with various other Federal authorities, in both the legislative and executive branches.

"In my judgment, the answer to that question must be 'Yes.'

"I believe it is absurd not to use this tax probe weapon, on a group which, from all evidence, is violating our tax laws, just as it has been violating so many other laws.

"I believe we could strike the Communist conspiracy where it would hurt the most, namely, in its financial artery, by turning the fullest light of investigation on Red financial trickery. This is more than a matter of definitely denying tax exemption to Red-front groups; it is a matter of an all-out tax investigation blitz on the Red conspiracy.

"Commissioner Andrews in his responses has commented on his organization's prompt followup in denying tax exemption to subversive groups.

"He has, however, raised the overall question as to the extent to which the Internal Revenue Service could depart from its regular tax review purpose for an auxiliary objective of assisting in investigating subversive forces financial operations, as such. The question as to just what should be the policy role of the Tax Bureau is in my judgment a very proper one to raise.

"However, in my view, the Internal Revenue Service can definitely find it administratively and legally feasible to do what I am asking. It can comply with both the letter and spirit of the law in making the type of comprehensive investigation which I am recommending.

"I recognize, of course, that the tax service has a job already on its hands with 50 million law-abiding Americans' tax returns.

"So, I believe, that, if necessary, it should seek additional staff for the purpose which I am recommending today, cracking down on Red lawbreakers. I believe further, that such an investigation could produce very fruitful results, in cooperation with those Federal sources, notably the great Federal Bureau of Investigation, which are necessarily the most expert in meeting the subversive problem, as such.

"In raising and reiterating this overall question, on which the Revenue Service has failed thus far to come to agreement with me, I should like to emphasize that I am not, of course, reflecting in any way on the stalwart anticommunism of Commissioner Andrews. He has been vigorously opposed to communism long before most folks were apparently even aware of this menace in our midst.

"I should like to say, moreover, that Commissioner Andrews has done a tremendous job in reorganizing and strengthening the Internal Revenue Service, and the Nation appreciates his efforts along this line. I understand that further improvements of tax machinery are in the works.

"I believe, however, that the antisubversive recommendation such as I am making today could add further credit both to his service and the Eisenhower administration as a whole.

"There follow excerpts from a few of my messages to him. They are preceded by an International News Service dispatch which apeared in, among many other papers, the April 10 Sunday Mirror of New York City. The dispatch is by Rose McKee, and is based upon my contact with Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER, of the House Un-American Activities Committee, along this same line.

"As the initial item, I am reprinting important excerpts from the book, Men Without Faces, written by Louis Francis Budenz and published by Harper & Bros. in 1948. These excerpts underline the importance of my efforts in exposing Red finances."

MEN WITHOUT FACES

(By Louis Francis Budenz)

The finances of the party were a complete mystery to most of the national committee members. Reports on finances were sometimes given and sometimes not; but it made little difference. As they were presented, very few people could make them out any way. It was quite clear that a much larger payroll was being met than the party dues and collections could account for. With the complication of district and section financing, for which separate books were kept, the whole thing became completely confounded.

The party always discreetly kept its financial records private until the Hitler-Stalin pact period. Their publication then meant little since they did not include the big secret fund under Robert William Weiner's control. However, that there were huge sums of money in the conspiratorial fund handled by Weiner and the secret committee cooperating with him, I knew to be a fact. At times Weiner had deposits amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars in various banks. On occasion, William Browder also deposited amounts up to a million dollars, sometimes in his own name. The source of funds was frequently a mystery, further increased by the practice of conveying thousands of dollars in cash back and forth between Weiner and the various unions and other organizations under Red control. These transactions never appeared on the books of any organization since they were so arranged that the money appeared to be in the cash fund of the union or other body making the loan to Weiner.

A basic source of these mysterious funds is from abroad, flowing into Weiner's hands from Moscow. The late Joseph Brodsky was one of the connecting links in this transmission. But the Red international apparatus insists that every fifth column must stand on its own feet whenever possible. What Soviet financial aid does is to make the Communist group a going concern, always sure of capitalization. Whenever a fifth column in any country is in dire need, it receives the assistance it requires. On that foundation, it is supposed to hustle for itself and, by influence with Hollywood stars of a Red tinge, tired businessmen who want a thrill, and wealthy young people who have inherited huge sums, to raise as much money as it can.

In the big Daily Worker drives for the subsidy of $200,000 needed each year, there were large sums of money given to sections and reported as their donation whose original source was vague. In 1944, business manager William Browder reported to me that we had $50,000 in the Daily Worker drive which we did not know how to handle. Weiner had delayed giving it over to us for fear of possible inquiry, which would be embarrassing. For weeks the money was on hand, but the fund-drive reports could not show it publicly. It finally got on the Daily Worker books by allocating it to various local groups.

Week after week Bill Browder as business manager and I as president of the corporation had to work out various ways of getting money for the paper. It was a trying experience, when we knew that $50,000 which could relieve us of most of our effort and worry was lying in the till.

The secret fund was used for a number of purposes. It financed the beginnings of Communist-created front organizations, setting them on their feet and giving them an initial financial advantage over any genuinely American competitor. It was also used to supplement the regular salaries of leading comrades with cash gifts for personal emergencies. Vacation trips, special visits to health resorts, extraordinary medical care, and similar items were paid for in cash by Weiner from this fund. Some comrades bought houses with this assistance; automobiles were also purchased the same way. But a more important use of this huge cash account was to finance the secret and illegal trips of the leading Reds to other countries. It was with the aid of this fund that Eisler, Browder, Dennis, Stachel, and all the others moved into Asia and Europe and back with forged passports. Since the expenses of these trips were laid out in cash and never accounted for, they did not appear on the books of the party.

In this particular illegal financial work, Weiner often used the name of "Blake."

Active in the administration of the secret fund with the alien Weiner was a native American whose wealthy family was connected with Wall Street brokerage interests. He was Lement U. Harris, who has long lived in an exclusive section of Westchester County near Chappaqua. From him I learned that this fund helped initiate a number of enterprises, including Barney Josephson's Cafe Society Uptown. The purpose was to make that night club a rendezvous for artists and entertainers and people of wealth, with whom Communists could there establish acquaintance.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of April 10, 1955]

WILEY PUSHES DRIVE FOR TAX CRACKDOWN ON REDS

(By Rose McKee)

WASHINGTON, April 9.—Senator WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin, invited the House Un-American Activities Committee today to join with him in pressing for a tax crackdown on Reds and Communist-front organizations.

WILEY, in a letter to House Committee Chairman WALTER, Democrat, Pennsylvania, said he believes the Internal Revenue Service has the legal right to make such an investigation.

WILEY told WALTER he has had "considerable correspondence" with Tax Commissioner T. Coleman Andrews on the subject.

He said Andrews "has questioned whether his agency can depart from its traditional effort to secure tax revenue for an auxiliary purpose of helping to crack down on the Communist conspiracy."

TELLS OF METHODS

The Senator said former Communists such as Louis Budenz have said that front organizations have collected millions of dollars for one cause or another, frequently transferring the money from one group to another to escape accountability.

He said he had in mind a "blitz type" of investigation that would "hit the Reds where it hurts—in the purse."

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
December 29, 1954.

The Honorable T. COLEMAN ANDREWS,
Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COMMISSIONER: I am writing to you with regard to a very important phase of the anti-Communist effort. I refer to the checking of tax returns of the great number of key individuals, organizations, and businesses within the Communist orbit in the United States.

As you know, the Reds have hatched all sorts of enterprises—companies and fronts have repeatedly transferred funds back and forth between them, and have otherwise juggled their books, according to strong evidence given to the FBI and to congressional investigative groups by ex-Communists.

It seems to me that we could sever the financial arteries of the Communist Party if a special effort were made to investigate the books of at least the major Red groups. In so doing, we could probably interfere with Red espionage in this country, which is dependent on disguised expenditures, of course. While they have probably covered their tracks carefully, an all-out probe would no doubt prove very fruitful.

I realize that this tax probe would be a very considerable undertaking, and that it would require a great deal of personnel. However, it seems to me that for too long, the Communists have been gettting away with financial trickery, and that they should be held to account taxwise, as well as in every other way.

I strongly believe that they have broken tax laws in handling the books of their fronts and of their key functionaries, just as they have broken other types of laws, in all their nefarious activities.

I would very much appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible, as to your reaction to this suggestion for an intensified effort in investigating their tax returns.

With all good wishes, I am.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
February 25, 1955.

The Honorable T. COLEMAN ANDREWS,
Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COMMISSIONER: * * * Since the Internal Revenue Service is necessarily not the most expert source on antisubversion but must necessarily rely on other Federal agencies, I hope that it will actively seek out what I know will be the ready cooperation of these other agencies rather than to sit back and wait for pertinent information to come to it.

As an example of the pressing need for interagency cooperation, I point out that a New York State Joint Legislative Committee has just indicated that three subversive groups—the Civil Rights Congress, the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, and the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee—raised, alone, a total of $3½ million, but spent most of it apparently for subversive purposes. What about the National Committee for Justice in the Rosenberg case, and similar well-financed ventures, I ask?

I am glad that action is being taken to deny tax exempt status to such subversive groups, but my feeling is that there is usually such a considerable time lag before these groups can be so officially designated that a great deal of money in the meanwhile pours into the Communist fronts.

I realize, of course, that there is a strict limitation on your available manpower, but I earnestly feel that if such manpower as might be available could be assigned to this task now, our country would reap significant dividends in terms of its security.

Moreover, if necessary, I believe that a request to the Senate and House Appropriations Committees for additional manpower to handle the task might be well received by the Congress.

I am enclosing herewith some remarks which I am making in my State this coming Sunday night, in which I urge an all-out effort.

In summary, I do think that if an investigative "blitz" could be launched on your own initiative against these Communist fronts, we could set the Communist conspiracy back on its heels for quite some time.

* * * * *

Looking forward to hearing from you, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

CONFIRMATION OF RED FINANCIAL MYSTERY FROM LOUIS BUDENZ

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, finances are part of the lifeblood of the Red conspiracy. Slash the financial artery, and the conspiracy—propaganda, espionage, sabotage, and so forth—will be severely restricted. Of course, Red fanaticism will continue, with or without money; but dollars or rubles still play a major part.

DOMESTIC SECURITY COMPATIBLE WITH WORLD SECURITY

What of the foreign policy implication of yesterday's actions?

As senior Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I assume that it will not be long before Moscow propaganda organs begin to shriek that the Treasury Department's action allegedly runs contrary to the so-called "peaceful co-existence" lullaby of the Kremlin. Our answer is this: The entire underground apparatus of the Communist Party in our own country and throughout the world completely belies the "peaceful coexistence" line of the Kremlin. The Kremlin has not called off a single spy, saboteur, or agitator either in our own country or anywhere else. There is no reason, therefore, why the Untied States should shrink back in the slightest from all-out legal action against the Red conspiracy in our midst. As a matter of fact, in our self-defense, I point out that the whole history of past such so-called peaceful periods between East and West evidences that they have been used by the Kremlin to intensify, rather than diminish, underground activity.

I hope our action on yesterday will serve as a model to other free peoples, a model which says this, in effect: "Smash the Red conspiracy by every legal means available. Meanwhile, hold fast to your basic liberties and continue your quest for world peace. After all, there is complete compatibility between the twin goals of domestic security on the home front and international security on the world front."

The Daily Worker will, no doubt, continue to be published through whatever makeshift arrangements it can devise. After all, the comrades must be informed as to what today's party line is, whether Comrade Stalin was a "bloody murderer," or whether he was really the "infallible genius" that he was pictured for three decades. The comrades must be informed whether Party Chief William Z. Foster must now get the ax because he was an unquestioning supporter of Stalin, or whether he is still the Kremlin's authentic mouthpiece.

Mr. President, let me conclude by stating that I, for one, yield to no man in my devotion to the faithful application of the Constitution or its Bill of Rights, even as regards the words and deeds of those whom we completely oppose and who completely oppose us. As the Supreme Court indicated, however, in its 7-to-2 decision on the witness immunity case just last Monday, there is no real reason why a constitutional guaranty—in that instance against self-incrimination—should serve as an absolute roadblock against the legal efforts of the Government of the United States to protect itself against those who would destroy it. "Freedom of the press" must stand as a great bulwark of our liberties. But the Red conspiracy must be smashed.

THE KANSAS CITY IDEA ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a new idea in foreign relations was recently tried out with great success by 31 civic, business, and professional leaders of Kansas City, Mo. The new approach on foreign relations by these American citizens is worthy of serious consideration.

Acting on the suggestion of Hal Hendrix, Latin America specialist of the Kansas City Star, 31 men made a 3-week good will trip, visiting 8 Latin American countries. On February 24, in an editorial entitled "Kansas City Looks South," the New York Times described this approach as "Something new and pleasant and important in the way of hemispheric relations." On March 7, Daniel James, writing from Kansas City for the New York Herald Tribune, said:

This bustling Midwestern capital may have the answer to the current Soviet offensive to win friends by offering economic aid. It certainly seems to have the answer to Moscow's recently announced economic penetration of Latin America, at any rate.

Even though these men were official ambassadors of good will from the Missouri city known as the Heart of America, each member paid all of his own expenses.

The immediate success of the trip was demonstrated by the warm hospitality and friendly reception accorded them in every area they visited. Veteran observers in South America reported newspaper and picture coverage of the visit of this Kansas City delegation was from 3 to 5 times as large as that received by any other delegation ever to visit in Latin America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a New York Times editorial of February 24, incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS CITY LOOKS SOUTH

Something new and pleasant and important in the way of hemispheric relations has just come to a successful conclusion. It was a trip of 30 leading professional and business men from Kansas City, Mo., headed by the city's vigorous mayor, H. Roe Bartle, to 8 of the Latin-American countries. This is surely the first time that a group of leading citizens from a municipality in the very heart of the United States has made such a journey.

The idea and the push came from the Kansas City Star, which in recent years has shown a commendable interest in Latin-American affairs. The group whose trip has just ended was constituted as the "Kansas City Commission for International Relations and Trade" by a resolution of the city council and it has a 3-year term. Under the resolution it has "the purpose of fostering good will in the Americas and strengthening hemispheric solidarity, particularly between Kansas City, Mo., its metropolitan area and our Latin-American neighbor Republics to the south." The commission started in Venezuela 3 weeks ago and visited Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina, Chile, Peru, Panama and Mexico before returning to Kansas City.

There was nothing eccentric about the idea. Kansas City is a booming and dynamic city which has much to offer to Latin America and it made sense for a group of civic leaders to call the attention of Latin Americans to the trade opportunities of their area. It is, besides, a national service for North Americans of this type to go around Latin America and show their interest in the region. The Middle West, with its historic isolationism, has certainly moved a long way out when Kansas City can send a delegation of this sort on such a trip.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, after getting approval of the State Department, Hal Hendrix presented his idea last fall to Kansas City's able and patriotic mayor, H. Roe Bartle. Mayor Bartle received the suggestion with enthusiasm, discussed it with the city council, and the council immediately authorized the Mayor to appoint a Kansas City Commission for International Relations and Trade.

So that members of the Senate and others interested in our foreign relations may note the varied fields of endeavor represented on the Kansas City Commission, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the commissioners and their businesses or professions be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS CITY COMMISSION FOR INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND TRADE

Hon. H. Roe Bartle, mayor, Kansas City, Mo.

J. E. Dunn, chairman of the commission, president of the J. E. Dunn Construction Co.

C. J. Kaney, vice chairman of the commission, president of the Swift & Henry Livestock Commission Co., and chairman of the metropolitan area planning council.

N. T. Veatch, vice chairman of the commission, Black & Veatch (engineers).

Louis B. McGee, secretary of the commission, and treasurer of the Old American Life Insurance Co.

Dr. Arnold V. Arms, official commission physician.

R. N. Bergendoff, senior partner, Howard, Needles, Tammen, & Bergendoff (bridge engineers).

Dudley C. Brown, partner, Brown & Loe (produce brokers).

Forrest D. Byars, executive secretary, downtown committee, chamber of commerce.

J. Roger DeWitt, president, the DeWitt Co. (real estate and investments).

Harry M. Gambrel, partner, Mann, Kerdolff, Kline & Welsh (insurance).

Kenneth G. Gillespie, vice president and general manager, Jenkins Music Co.

Edward C. Gosnell, president, Inter-Collegiate Press (manufacturers and publishers).

George Fuller Green (real estate and investments), member, Kansas City Board of Park Commissioners.

Hal Hendrix, Latin American specialist, the Kansas City Star.

John D. Hilburn, president, Boese-Hilburn Electric Co., and president, Advertising and Sales Executives Club.

C. Earl Hovey (United States patent attorney).

Lowell R. Johnson, executive vice president, Puritan Compressed Gas Corp.

Ray E. Lawrence, Black & Veatch (project engineering).

Beverly Miller, president, Allied Independent Theatre Owners, Inc.

John O'Keefe, owner, O'Keefe Travel Service, and honorary vice consul of Spain.

Alfred F. Parmelee, president, United States Safety Service Co. (manufacturers and distributors of safety equipment).

Joseph V. Quigley, chairman of the board of Chapman Dairy Co. (Sealtest) and Franklin Ice Cream Co.

Walter A. Reich, president, A. Reich & Sons, Inc. (produce distributors).

Nathan Rieger, president, Mercantile Bank & Trust Co.

Charles C. Shafer, Jr., attorney at law and city councilman.

Frank H. Spink, president, Bunting Hardware Co., and president, board of police commissioners.

Eugene F. Stanton, president, Klughartt Machinery Co. (agricultural equipment).

Fred R. Suddarth, president, Kaw Transport Co., Inc., and president, Blue Valley Manufacturers & Merchants Association.

R. Carter Tucker, director and general counsel, Rudy Patrick Seed Co.

Lancie L. Watts, tax attorney, commission interpreter, and past president, Kansas City Lawyers Association.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on February 2 the Commission visited Washington for an official briefing by State Department officials, departing immediately thereafter on this good-will tour, which took them to Venezuela, Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina, Chile, Peru, Panama, and Mexico.

Upon return to Kansas City, February 24, the Commissioners did not halt their efforts for better understanding with our South American neighbors. Instead, they immediately started a heavy schedule of reports to civic, church, and school groups, and also appeared often on radio and television.

Following the trip, the Commission announced a program of scholarships for Latin American students at colleges and universities in the Kansas City area, the sponsoring of an International Trade Fair next spring, and the entertaining of several Latin American officials in Kansas City next fall.

In my opinion, Mr. President, this leadership by Kansas City in the field of inter-American relations deserves the notice and approval of the entire Nation.

The dedicated zeal of this particular group of business and professional men, representing all that is best in the American way of life, may well have set a pattern for future visits by comparable groups, not only to South America but throughout the entire world.

The far-reaching effect this tour could have on foreign policy was reported in the Kansas City Times on March 3. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article made a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATIN TRIP DRAWS PRAISE FROM AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

WASHINGTON, March 2.—Henry F. Holland, Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Latin America, said today the trip of a group of Kansas City officials and businessmen to Latin America last month contributed to the mutual understanding we are striving for in this hemisphere.

"Reports received by the State Department from our Ambassadors in Latin America," Holland said, "indicate that the trip of the Kansas City commission for international relations and trade was most successful.

"In each of the cities visited by the commission, it made an excellent impression. They had the opportunity to talk with the presidents of a number of countries, as well as with other high officials, business and professional men.

"The friendliness of members of the group and their genuine interest in the countries visited contributed to the success of their mission. It is certainly true that Kansas City is now known and appreciated more in Latin America than at any time in the past.

"The trip of this commission made a worthwhile contribution to the mutual understanding we are striving for in this hemisphere."

The commission, which spent 3 weeks in Latin America, was headed by Mayor A. Roe Bartle and J. E. Dunn, commission chairman.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, this new idea in foreign relations was further noted in an article appearing in the New York Herald Tribune on March 7. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article, which was reprinted in over 137 additional newspapers, be made a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KANSAS CITY IDEA

(By Daniel James)

KANSAS CITY, MO.—This bustling Midwestern capital may have the answer to the current Soviet offensive to win friends by offering economic aid. It certainly seems to have the answer to Moscow's recently announced economic penetration of Latin America, at any rate.

Kansas City's answer is not to wait for Federal action, but to act on your own. As a result, it has jumped with both feet into the tense international arena, and become the first American municipality to send a friendship-and-trade delegation to Latin America.

Just back after 3 weeks in 8 Latin American countries, the delegation, consisting of 30 prominent Kansas Citians headed by dynamic Mayor H. Roe Bartle, has scored some impressive results.

First and foremost, the idea of a group of private United States' citizens paying Latin America a friendly call, without in any way being sopnsored by Washington, has made the Latins happier than anything we've done in recent years.

The peripatetic Kansas Citians, as a matter of fact, got a bigger press in Latin America than any official United States delegation of late.

In the second place, some good commercial contacts were made which promise to profit both Kansas City and Latin America tangibly. The tour, then, was not just a glad-handing affair.

Nor was it a one-shot affair. Kansas City is planning at least 2 similar trips within the next 2 years, besides other related activities in line with a new international program it has initiated.

The idea of promoting trade and friendship between Kansas City and Latin America was originated by Hal Hendrix, Latin American specialist of the Kansas City Star, who promptly sold it to Mayor Bartle.

Hendix' idea took concrete form last November, when the mayor, himself, a longtime exponent of inter-American solidarity, was authorized to appoint an International Relations and Trade Commission.

The commission's major purpose, as laid down in a city ordinance, is to acquaint Latin America with Kansas City's "trade opportunities, economic development, and cultural life, and to develop better understanding among the people of the Greater Kansas City community of the cultural and social life of the countries of Latin America."

To make his commission both representative and potent, Bartle appointed 30 of Kansas City's most promient citizens, ranging from a suave patent attorney to a roughhewn cattleman. The 30 at once decided to look over Latin America for themselves, instead of sending a study group, and each paid his own way to the tune of about $3,000.

The commission's only connection with Washington was to go there for a briefing by various Government agencies, and to promise a report.

I interviewed Mayor Bartle and six of his commission members 2 days after they returned home from Latin America, and can report without exaggeration that I have rarely seen such enthusiastic supporters of Pan Americanism.

"They say we're isolationists here in Kansas City," Mayor Bartle boomed in his infectiously friendly way. "But we aren't. We very much believe in hemispheric solidarity."

Commission Chairman J. E. Dunn, who heads a flourishing construction company, repeated several times:

"We need South America more than it needs us."

All members of the delegation I interviewed were unanimous in asserting that boundless economic opportunities exist south of the border.

Commission Vice Chairman C. J. Kaney, one of America's leading cattlemen, told me:

"Many South American cities are moving ahead faster than ours. Latin America is a giant just about to wake up."

The Kansas Citians stressed that Americans could play a decisive role in Latin America's future, and thus earn its undying friendship, by supplying it with American know-how.

Illustrating the point, Commission member, C. Earl Hovey, a shrewed patent lawyer, told me that a Kansas City vending-machine company helped a Mexican affiliate expand its output 30 percent by lending it the use of United States patents.

At least three of the touring Kansas Citians made direct commercial contacts in as many South American countries. One proposes, for example, to manufacture unbreakable eyeglasses.

The Commission's report to Washington will stress these Latin needs:

1. Loans, especially for transportation.

2. Easier credit. The midwesterners found that the Latins prefer to buy from Europe, even where the goods are inferior to ours, because they get better credit terms.

3. Development of barter. Since some major Latin American exports—wheat and cattle, for example—are not needed by us, we should develop a three-way barter system by which they can be exported elsewhere, but in return enabling Latin America to get manufactured items from us.

4. More United States know-how. Our businessmen and technicians, the Kansas Citians feel, must aid Latin American expansion by lending it their experience, merchandising methods, and technological knowledge.

Emphasizing that Kansas City's interest in Latin America is real and permanent, Dunn pointed out:

"We didn't go down there to plant a seed and let it die. We have just begun. We're going to keep working at this through our city, and Washington as well."

Several Commission members observed that Soviet Premier Bulganin's offer of increased trade with Latin America is being taken seriously there, but such ventures as Kansas City's could more than offset any possible damage the Soviets can do.

Already, the Kansas City idea seems to be catching on elsewhere. St. Louis and Detroit now contemplate sending delegations to Latin America. Kansas City itself will follow up with an international fair in September, which will feature Latin America.

Is it farfetched to hope that the Kansas City idea will also be applied to other parts of the world, notably Asia and Africa? If it can be, it may well be the answer to the new Soviet economic offensive. For if anyone can outsell Moscow's star salesmen, Khrushchev and Bulganin, it is the American businessman once he gets going.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The wide notice given this program was also heralded in a roundup of newspaper comments appearing in the Kansas City Times on March 21. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS OTHERS SEE GOOD-WILL TOUR

Kansas City not only has strengthened its friendship and trade ties with Latin America as a result of the recent good-will tour of the new Commission for International Relations and Trade. By its initiative, it also has awakened the interest of numerous United States cities in better hemispheric understanding.

Newspapers in various parts of the country have commented editorially on what has become known as the Kansas City Idea. Several United States cities are suggesting closer relationships with our community. Some publications even have expressed a note of jealousy.

Several cities have launched plans to send commissions similar to the Kansas City group to Latin America on good will and trade missions. Some have written here to seek the organization formula. New York and Buffalo, N. Y., are in the development stages. The mayor of Miami, Randall N. Christmas, has appointed a 14-member commission. The group plans to depart for Latin America April 15.

"This is a frank bid for Latin American trade," commented the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, "and it could be hugely successful. What irritates us is that the Kansas City group is doing something that St. Louis should have been doing for years. Latin American markets have been open to us and we have done precious little to cultivate them by concentrated promotion. If Kansas City can send a trade delegation to beat the drums for business in Latin America, why can't St. Louis?"

On a different plane, the New York Herald Tribune comments that this "Midwestern capital (Kansas City) may have the answer to the current Soviet offensive to win friends by offering economic aid. It certainly seems to have the answer to Moscow's recently announced economic penetration of Latin America, at any rate."

The Herald Tribune points out that "Kansas City's answer is not to wait for Federal action, but to act on your own. As a result it has jumped with both feet into the tense international arena, and become the first American municipality to send a friendship-and-trade delegation to Latin America.

"Is it farfetched to hope that the Kansas City idea will also be applied to other parts of the world, notably Asia and Africa? If it can be, it may well be the answer to the Soviets. For if anyone can outsell Moscow's star salesmen, Khrushchev and Bulganin, it is the American businessman once he gets going."

The Mobile (Ala.) Press states that "leaders of this Gulf Port city might do well to keep a keen eye on a new movement launched in Kansas City to promote friendship and trade in Latin America. . . . A movement of this kind, although centering in a Midwestern community, is of considerable significance to Mobile. It can be expected that some of the trade that develops therefrom in the future will funnel through Mobile."

"The high-powered mission of Kansas Citians should bring more business through the Port of Houston," the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle notes. "What's good for Kansas City is good for Houston."

The Miami (Fla.) Daily News comments that Kansas City "is approaching this good-neighbor idea with common sense. Kansas City may be tucked away in the heartland of the United States, but there is no reason it cannot become a partner in business with Latin America."

In Latin America itself, the Journal of Caracas, Venezuela, noted that the Venezuelan capital has learned that "Kansas City is a tremendous agricultural and industrial metropolis of the Midwest with a big heart and eyes that see far. The Kansas City delegation proved that the Midwest is no longer an isolationist stronghold; the Midwest wants to be a good neighbor, too."

It was quipped recently that Kansas City is the only municipality in the United States of America with its own built-in State department. Editorial comments seem to bear this out.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I believe Members of the Senate and other students of our foreign relations will find the work of the Kansas City Trade Commission of increasing significance. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the commission's official report, as filed last week with the State Department, the Treasury Department, and the Export-Import Bank, be made a part of the RECORD at this point, and I direct particular attention to the 20 specific recommendations appearing at the end thereof.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE KANSAS CITY COMMISSION FOR INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND TRADE—LATIN-AMERICAN FACTFINDING TRIP FEBRUARY 1956

This is a report of impressions, observations, and suggestions of the Kanass City Commission for International Relations and Trade following its first factfinding tour of eight Latin American nations.

The report represents the concensus of the 30 members of the commission, each of whom paid all of his individual expenses for the 24-day trip that covered more than 15,000 miles. Even though the commission now is an authorized unit of the municipal government of the city of Kansas City, Mo., there was no expenditure of taxpayers' funds for any phase of our mission.

For purposes of background, the city council of Kansas City in November 1955, adopted a resolution authorizing the mayor to establish the Kansas City Commission for International Relations and Trade and to name 30 members to serve 3-year terms.

The resolution stated that "the commission shall be authorized to represent Kansas City and its metropolitan area for the purpose of acquainting the Latin American countries with this area's trade opportunities, economic development, and cultural life, and to develop a better understanding among the people of the Greater Kansas City community of the economic potentialities and the cultural and social life of the countries of Latin America."

Mayor H. Roe Bartle appointed the commission membership and named J. E. Dunn as chairman, Cliff J. Kaney and N. T. Veatch as vice chairmen, and Louis B. McGee as secretary. The membership represents a cross section of Kansas City's business, industrial, agricultural, professional, and cultural leadership.

For the commission's first project, it chose to visit the countries of Venezuela, Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina, Chile, Peru, Panama, and Mexico. At the invitation of officials of the State Department, the Commission first visited Washington for briefings on the areas to be visited.

At the outset of this report, we wish to express our gratitude to State, Commerce, and Treasury Departments, the Export-Import Bank, and the Pan-American Union for the excellent briefings given the commission when it visited in Washington February 2 to start the mission. As our trip progressed we found all the information gained in these briefings most helpful in becoming oriented with situations in the various Latin American nations.

We also wish to state that every embassy of the United States in the countries we visited could not possibly have been more cooperative. The caliber of each Ambassador and his staff made each one of us feel very proud of our Government. We know our Government's affairs in Latin America are in most able hands. At every turn we saw the work of these competent Foreign Service officers reflected in a sincere feeling of warmth for the United States of America. We cannot express enough commendation for our capable diplomatic service in Latin America.

In our 24-day factfinding trip we were privileged to meet and enjoy highly informative discussions with presidents, cabinet officials, governors, mayors, city councilmen, and leaders of business, industry, finance, health, professions, and education. We met and talked with literally hundreds of Latin Americans, rich and poor, and United States citizens living in Latin America. We inspected housing projects, schools, trafficways, oilfields, ranches, parks, hospitals, cultural centers, retail establishments, dairies, manufacturing plants, and many other fields of interest.

Bearing in mind that the membership of the commission, with three exceptions, never had seen any of Latin America beyond Mexico, the group returned to Kansas City unanimous in two conclusions: The United States needs Latin America as much or more than Latin American needs the United States of America, and we are more cognizant than ever before of the interdependence of the 20 Latin American republics and the United States of America.

Everywhere the commission traveled it was greeted with friendliness, understanding, and enthusiasm. People in every country were genuinely interested in making certain that we had every opportunity to obtain all the facts we sought. Outstanding courtesy was the rule. No one attempted to apply pressure. Everyone we visited shared our desire to strengthen our social and economic ties and to develop a stronger, healthier, better educated, and more prosperous family of the Americas. The commission is deeply appreciative of the kindness and courtesy extended to us by everyone.

We found a strong similarity between the people of North America and Latin America. We found a desire for a much better way of life. We found them experiencing a social revolution to attain this natural goal. We found them proud, patriotic, and independent people, who, under no circumstances, appeared to be willing to trade freedom for communism in their quest for a better life.

We found that the Latin Americans do not want charity nor handouts in the form of Government grant aids from this country. We learned they need and welcome our assistance in the form of loans for projects that will lead to a better way of living than now exists in some sections of the area. We found some adverse reactions and dissatisfaction over the policies of our Government with respect to billions of dollars given in grant aids to countries of Europe and Asia.

We found discontent over the failure of Secretary of State Dulles to visit Latin American countries. It was pointed out to us repeatedly that he has visited nearly everywhere in Europe and the Far East, but only once to Latin America—and then only to attend the Inter-American conference at Caracas in 1954. Each time the question arose, mainly in press conferences, Mayor Bartle and Chairman Dunn met it by stating that Secretary Dulles' trip abroad has been made to help meet problems that might grow and endanger or engulf the Western Hemisphere and the rest of the free world. It was noted that we have good friends in Latin America and a person or a country doesn't have to worry about good friends.

With the great natural resources that lie untapped in South America, it is our firm belief that in helping the Latin Americans satisfy their demands for a broader development of their economies, we will be helping ourselves. It is not enough just to make loans of dollars. We must give them more of ourselves in sharing our know-how and showing them how to best obtain the things they need most. By being this kind of a friend, we can plant seeds that will bear good fruit and we, as well as Latin America, can share in enjoying the fruits of these efforts in the years ahead.

The commission found the technical assistance program of the United States Government to be a tremendous asset in each of the countries visited. We feel this is one of the best expenditures of United States Government funds that can be made in Latin America.

Private investment, by both Latin American and foreign capital, appears to be one of the best avenues for greater production and consequent higher standards of living in Latin America. Venezuela certainly affords an outstanding example of what foreign private investment, with its technical know-how, can do to better general living conditions. We found, however, in some countries varying degrees of nationalism that constituted a handicap to development through foreign capital. This nationalism has, in some instances, developed very cumbersome restrictions. Such measures could easily discourage a potential investor.

We found United States business firms operating in Latin America making a marked contribution to the development of the countries in which they were established. Some of these investments, such as the Creole Petroleum Co. in Venezuela, provided a model example of cooperation and assistance in the form of better housing, health and working conditions and education for national employees. We found all the United States business officials to be very effective in interpreting to the nationals the policies of our Republic. This appeared with such firms as Pan American World Airways, the W. R. Grace Co., Sears, Roebuck & Co., United States Steel, Standard Oil, General Motors, and others with whom we were associated.

Three Latin American needs stand out as most pressing to the commission. They are needs for additional educational facilities, additional roads and highways, and additional power-producing facilities.

Shortage of school facilities appears to be general. As an example a Chilean educator noted that his school was providing education for about 1,200 boys and girls, but if the school facilities were enlarged and staffed accordingly the same education could be given to 12,000 boys and girls in that community.

Shortages of roads and highways also appear to be general. We learned in Brazil alone that there were only 1,800 miles of paved highways compared to approximately 560,000 miles in this country, and Brazil is much larger in area than the United States. We also learned of many instances in which foodstuffs rotted in the production areas because of inadequate transportation and distribution facilities. A highway network and many farm-to-market roads are absolute necessities if substantial gains are to be made in bettering living conditions.

Power shortages also constitute a serious handicap to the development the Latin Americans are seeking. Nearly all the countries have hydroelectric potentials, but in most cases they are stymied because of dollar shortages. The Export-Import Bank loan for a large Brazilian powerplant will contribute tremendously to Brazil's industrial activities, but one plant isn't going to solve but

a fraction of the demand. It also seems to the commission that development of Brazil's oil industry at a much faster rate is an absolute must if its industrial growth is to continue in the race of demand brought on by the tremendous population increase, which is growing at the estimated rate of 2 million annually.

Inflation in some of the countries the commission visited, particularly Chile and Brazil, is another major point of distress observed. Its negative effects are very obvious, but we heard encouraging reports of programs being undertaken to curb inflation.

In connection with foreign trade, the commission heard many times that European countries and Japan are beginning to make sizable inroads on the Latin American market. The chief reasons appeared to be lower product costs, because of correspondingly lower labor costs in these foreign production centers; more attractive credit terms; more opportunities for barter with other dollar-short countries, and lower shipping costs. The long-term credit feature appeared to be the most dominant. The commission learned that United States products were higher in quality and more desired but that Latin American purchases now have to be tailored to fit the Latin American pocketbooks.

The commission also learned that Latin Americans are far better acquainted with the United States than citizens of this country are with Latin America. The commission is firmly convinced that there is a large area for expansion in this country for a better understanding of Latin America, its peoples, and its countries.

The commission is privileged to have as a member a representative of the medical profession who travelled as official commission physician. He visited and was highly impressed with physicians he met in the hospitals and medical institutions seen. His views and observations are shared by the commission.

We learned that a majority of the medical men we met either had visited or studied in the United States, and several had received scholarships from the Rockefeller or Kellogg Foundations. We learned that a real problem in the medical field is not in finding capable recent graduates who desire to come to the United States on scholarships for further training, but rather that professors and instructors in medical schools feel that much of this expensive training is being wasted since many young physicians are not able to practice their knowledge of new techniques upon returning to their own countries because of a lack of facilities or special equipment. We learned this has created a severe shortage of practicing medical specialists. For example, there is only one internal medical specialist in Caracas, Venezuela, a city of almost 1 million inhabitants.

The commission also learned that instructors and professors in medical centers feel a strong need for refresher courses and opportunity for study and research in their specialty fields, but are not eligible for the aforementioned scholarships unless they take the entire postgraduate course prescribed for them, generally the same courses given young students. We learned that transportation expenses are keeping these instructors at home, where no postgraduate training is available. The commission feels the medical instructors should have better opportunities to study the latest medical advances made in this country.

The Kansas City Commission for International Relations and Trade would respectfully submit the following recommendations to the United States Government:

1. Intensify its financial assistance in the form of loans for sound development projects, such as road construction and powerplants.

2. Consider extending loans strictly for educational purposes, such as school construction and teacher training.

3. Intensify its technical assistance programs in all Latin American nations, with increased numbers of skilled technicians and specialists.

4. Expand existing programs of education and cultural exchange cooperation, including scholarships for both Latin American and United States students, expansion of binational centers, and refresher training for teachers and professors.

5. Encourage more practicing Latin American doctors to visit the United States for training in the latest specialty medical techniques and skills and hospital operation.

6. Encourage oragnizations sponsoring medical scholarships in this country to amend their programs to add transportation costs to scholarship awards, and include refresher training and research for medical teachers, professors, and instructors; explore the feasibility of establishing a special fund in existing cultural exchange programs of our Government to assist Latin American medical instructors in keeping abreast of advancements made in our institutions.

7. Explore the feasibility of making more loans to speed up the mechanization of agriculture in Latin America.

8. Encourage United States producers and manufacturers to offer more attractive credit terms to Latin American countries and customers.

9. Develop a program to better acquaint manufacturers throughout the United States interested in export with the money exchange and freedom of restriction of exchange in each South American country.

10. Encourage United States manufacturers to prepare their South American correspondence in Spanish or Portuguese, and to print their sales brochures, circulars, etc., in the same manner.

11. Send to South America men trained in installment credit to aid in establishing and training South American merchants in the use of credit interchange bureaus.

12. Encourage all Latin American countries to eradicate any remaining cumbersome and complex business operation restrictions and work toward an areawide equal climate favorable to foreign investment capital.

13. Encourage more United States firms to explore the advantages of establishing productive operations in Latin American nations, including an examination of existing obstacles in this country to private investment abroad.

14. Adhere to bipartisan and stable trade policies with all Latin American nations.

15. Explore the formation of an international board of trade operation, through which a broad based program of barter exchange could be developed to aid countries with low dollar earning power.

16. Explore the possibility of enlisting the services of men of nationally known ability in business and industry in the United States to advise and assist Latin American governments with development problems, in the same manner that our economic leaders have served the United States, if the Latin American nations desire such assistance.

17. Encourage the United States school system to participate in more exchange-of-idea programs and cultural projects with Latin American nations.

18. Encourage more communities of this country to send delegations on fact-finding tours of Latin America, and at the same time lend official encouragement to Latin American cities to send delegations of their leaders to this country for a similar purpose.

19. Encourage the public information media of this country to disseminate more informative and constructive news about Latin America.

20. Encourage more missionary work on the part of all denominations for the purpose of elevating the way of life among the lesser developed areas of these countries.

It has been a most interesting and rewarding experience for this commission to represent Kansas City and the United States on its mission. There is no doubt in the minds of the commission members about the future of Latin America. While it is recognized that conditions in some countries today provide fertile ground for Communist infiltration, the commission is convinced that the Latin American people are devout, freedom-loving individuals who will not become gullible prey of the Communist doctrine. Latin America is on the march to become a powerful economic area of the free world.

This commission believes that our country's future prosperity and freedom are very closely related to that of Latin America. Two devastating world wars have strained this country's strategic resources. In this atomic age in which we are living, the wealth of strategic materials in the soil of Latin America could well be considered the guardian of freedom of the Americas. We have a great and important relationship of interdependence with our Latin American countries in this age. A much closer person-to-person and community-to-community relationship between the nations of the Western Hemisphere is essential if we are to sustain freedom and opportunity for all other liberty-loving people of the world.

The people of Latin America are our friends. It is mutually important that we build stronger and better-understood political, cultural, and economic ties between us. If we are a people of good will and share our many blessings, God's peace will be ours for many years to come.

Respectfully submitted.

The commission: J. E. Dunn,[1] chairman; C. J. Kaney,[1] vice chairman; N. T. Veatch, vice chairman; Louis B. McGee,[1] secretary; Arnold V. Arms, M. D.; R. N. Bergendoff; Dudley C. Brown; Forrest D. Byars; J. Roger DeWitt; Harry M. Gambrel; Kenneth G. Gillespie[1]; Edward C. Gosnell; George Fuller Green; Hal Hendrix[1]; John D. Hilburn; C. Earl Hovey[1]; Lowell R. Johnson; Ray E. Lawrence; Beverly Miller; John O'Keefe; Alfred F. Parmelee; Joseph V. Quigley; Walter A. Reich; Nathan Rieger; Charles C. Shafer, Jr.; Frank H. Spink; Eugene F. Stanton; Fred R. Suddarth; R. Carter Tucker; Lancie L. Watts; Mayor H. Roe Bartle,[1] Ex Officio.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In closing this commendation of a group of patriotic and unselfish men, I am reminded that what we of the free world want more than anything else is permanent world peace.

What better way could there be toward that desirable end than this Kansas City idea for spreading friendliness and good will among our neighbors—an atmosphere sadly lacking in some other parts of the world.

I am sure all America wishes to thank these men of Kansas City for their leadership in the interest of world peace.

THE MODERNIZED PARITY FORMULA

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have today sent to Secretary of Agriculture Benson, with reference to the so-called modernized parity formula.

[1] Members of the report committee.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Your statements to the press yesterday with reference to the dual-parity formula have caused me deep concern. You seem determined to put the so-called modernized parity formula for basic farm commodities into effect at all costs.

The so-called modernized parity formula, as you know, uses as its major provision in determining parity (fair price) the average price received by farmers for the previous 10-year period. Presently the prices received by farmers are averaging about 80 percent of parity. If farm prices continue at this low level for the next 10 years, then this low level of farm prices becomes parity or a fair price 10 years from now. That is wrong in principle. Almost every farm organization recognizes this, as was evidenced nearly everywhere the Senate Agriculture Committee held hearings throughout the United States last fall.

It is inconceivable that either labor or industry would ever sanction the use of any formula which would tie them to the average price received for the previous 10-year period. Both labor and industry, as you know, use as their base in making similar price calculations that favorable period of 1947 to 1949. In view of this, why should agriculture be subjected to this unreasonable principle which provides that the fair price in future years is based on the average price received for the previous 10-year period, no matter how adverse it may be.

It may be wrong, to some extent, to continue the dual-parity formula indefinitely. There is every justification, however, to continue the dual-parity formula until the Department of Agriculture can come forward with a new parity formula which will be more reasonable and fair to the farmers of America. The modernized parity formula is wrong in principle. As a Senator from a farming area, I do not feel it possible for me to compromise on a principle which I think is wrong. If permitted to go into effect, the modernized parity formula would do inestimable damage to the whole cause of agriculture.

The dairy farmers of America, recognizing that the modernized parity formula was doing an injustice to them, were able to have a provision inserted in the Senate agriculture bill which permits them to use the base period from 1946 to 1950. By this action they were able to set aside application of the modernized parity formula so far as the dairy industry is concerned. This action was completely justified and I was happy to support it.

I was pleased to note that no Member of the Senate—Republican or Democrat—moved to strike this provision from the agriculture bill. This in itself indicates the widespread disapproval of the so-called modernized parity formula.

It is my sincere hope that the Department of Agriculture will make an immediate study of parity formulas and that you will have ready for consideration by Congress next January a new parity formula that will be more fair to all segments of agriculture.

Respectfully yours,

MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator.

THE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, 10 days ago, on March 19, the day the Senate finally passed the Agricultural Act of 1956, I made the following statement as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in concluding my remarks during that long debate:

Mr. President, let me conclude by saying that I hope all this is done before the Easter recess is taken. I think Congress needs an Easter recess; but I think America needs a farm bill worse than Congress needs a recess.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I heard the Senator make his statement about how much America needs a farm bill, and I concur wholeheartedly in everything he has said in that connection. However, I would not want the country to think—and I know the Senator would not want it to think—that it is at all possible to get a farm bill out of conference between now and the time the House is scheduled to go on its Easter recess, before Good Friday. As a matter of fact, the leaders on both sides of the aisle in the Senate conferred yesterday at some length, and conferred with the leaders on both sides in the other body. It was the consensus of the members of the conference committee of both parties—and a rather lengthy colloquy took place in the House—that it would be impossible to do a thorough and adequate job of bringing in a conference report before probably the latter part of next week.

I wished to have the Senator know that that sentiment is expressed by both Democrats and Republicans, by the majority leadership as well as the minority leadership.

So far as I know, every single Senator would be willing to remain here on Good Friday, Saturday, Monday, and Tuesday, if there was any hope of getting a bill. However, the fact is that there is no such hope. Representatives ANDRESEN, HOPE, and COOLEY say it is necessary for their subcommittees to study many of the amendments placed in the bill by the Senate, and that in their opinion it would require several days, even after agreement was reached on all the items, to have the conference report written up and printed. The majority leader was informed—and he so informed the minority leader, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and other Senators who are very much interested in the subject—that there was absolutely no hope of having a report and having it printed and available for consideration until after the Easter recess.

Mr. MUNDT. The majority leader was unduly worried if he felt that I was about to try to indict the Democratic leadership.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will yield, the majority leader did not intend to imply that he was worried at all. He was attempting to convey to his beloved friend from South Dakota information which he assumed the Senator from South Dakota did not possess, in the light of the statement he was making.

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate the information, and I shall comment upon it when I conclude reading what I said 10 days ago, at the time the debate was concluded.

I wish to reiterate what I said 10 days ago in concluding debate on the farm bill. I said at that time:

Mr. President, let me conclude by saying that I hope all this is done before the Easter recess is taken. I think Congress needs an Easter recess; but I think America needs a farm bill worse than Congress needs a recess. If there is any tendency in the other body to drag heels or to delay action in conference, I suggest that we abandon the Easter recess rather than abandon the idea of having a new farm bill for the farmers to use in the crop year 1956. Time is running short but there is still time to complete this task by Easter—and we should resolve to stay here in session until conference approval is completed.

That concludes the statement I made 10 days ago, at the time we were debating the farm bill.

I rise today to reiterate every word of what I said 10 days ago. I know that the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held our committee in session virtually day and night, in his very constructive and commendable effort to push the farm bill forward for action in time to make it effective this year; but I do not believe the Congress should begin its spring recess until it concludes action upon the conference report on the farm bill.

Much could have been done in conference during the past 10 days, and undoubtedly much has been done. I shall not speculate on that subject.

However, this I know: The spring work season is upon us in the farm belt now. Our farmers have a right to know under what farm program they will be working in 1956. Congress has the duty to give them this information. If necessary, therefore, I say to our leaders, we should postpone our spring recess by a week or two. We cannot turn back the calendar or retard the advance of spring. We can postpone our recess, but we cannot change the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas attempted to make it abundantly clear to the Senator from South Dakota and every other Senator that that was the offer yesterday of the leadership on both sides of the aisle. We offered to postpone the recess if any good could come from it.

However, the conferees are postponing their recess, and they are meeting day and night. If the Senator will read the RECORD, he will note that the conferees have said there is no hope of having the conference report ready for consideration before week after next.

Mr. MUNDT. Of course, this I know, and the Senator from Texas knows also, that no conferees sitting on a Thursday of one week can set a time schedule and state definitely that they cannot conclude consideration of a matter until a week thereafter. Perhaps they may be able to conclude the matter earlier. That is entirely possible. Therefore, I say we should stay in session and urge them to complete their work earlier.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should think, however, that the conferees from both parties would be better informed as to when they could conclude their business than an individual Senator who

makes a speech and says he is willing to stay here through the Easter holidays.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree that they may have a better educated guess than I, but their guess is nevertheless not to be taken as absolutely accurate. We have a tremendously serious problem on our hands, and it is a problem which must be solved. I believe we should stay in session until that important problem is solved.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to our distinguished chairman.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator for the compliments he has paid me. I fully expected to have the conference report ready by tomorrow. As a matter of fact, I discussed the matter with the leadership, with both the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. The majority leader even agreed to have the Senate stay in session on Friday and Saturday if we could get the House to act.

However, we cannot control the action of the House. I was terribly disappointed yesterday when it was made known by the House leadership that it would take a few days for the Members of the House to read over the report and that there was no possibility of even considering the report this week.

Therefore, what the conferees have decided to do is to remain in session during the Easter recess until we get through with the job. It is my hope that not later than Saturday of this week we will have the conference report in shape.

Mr. MUNDT. Of this week, did the Senator say?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; Saturday of this week. However, under the rules of the House, as the Senator knows, the report must lie over for a day. We could not reach our goal this week, therefore.

I am very sorry about that, as the Senator knows. Let me go back a little bit in time. The Senator knows that when Congress was in session early in January, I expressed the hope that we could have the farm bill before the Senate on the 15th of February.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator not only expressed that hope, but he did everything a human being could do to make that hope come true.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. In making that prediction I forgot about the usual Lincoln Day holiday which is taken by the Republicans. Because of that there was a delay, as the Senator knows. Let us not try to blame each other for that.

Mr. MUNDT. If I may interrupt the Senator at that point, I should like to have the record made abundantly clear that I have not indicated that there has been any derelection of duty on the part of the Democratic leadership. I have been very careful in that regard. I am sure the majority leader will bear me out. I am pointing out what one Member of the Senate has a right to point out, even though he knows he cannot control the action of the other body, and to express his resentment at the fact that the other body has decided to go home when an important matter like the farm bill is under consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not think it is fair to blame anyone. The leadership on both sides of the aisle were in agreement that we stay here and complete the bill if we thought there was any chance at all of completing it.

However, if the Senator will read the RECORD at page 5686 of yesterday, he will note that there are 38 Senate amendments that must be considered.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is an optimist. The Senator from Louisiana thought we would pass the Senate bill a long time before we actually did pass it. The Senator from Louisiana was willing to sit all during the holiday that we had agreed we would take over Lincoln Day. However, because it has been customary to take that holiday, we carried out our agreement in that respect.

We met with the House leadership. I do not wish to criticize the House by implication or otherwise. Under the rules of the House, the House does not have an opportunity to debate the subject as fully and as thoroughly as the Senate does. In addition, there are 38 amendments to be considered.

We have taken care of only a few of those amendments. The Senator knows that Good Friday is upon us. I do not believe that the Senator from South Dakota or his farmers in South Dakota would advocate that we meet on Good Friday.

Mr. MUNDT. I am willing to take Good Friday off.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The House says it has various subcommittees dealing with individual commodities, like wheat, corn, and cotton, which must consider various amendments that the Senate has added to the bill. They have made it abundantly clear that in their opinion nothing could be gained by the House or the Senate or both staying in session next week.

The conferees have canceled their trip home. They have made a sacrifice. They are going to stay here to try to get it through. Perhaps their guess is bad; but, after all the parties had talked with the leadership on both sides of the aisle—and the Senator will see what was said if he will refer to the RECORD—and it was felt that no conference report would be available before Monday a week.

Mr. MUNDT. I may say to my distinguished friend from Texas in concluding my remarks, that earlier in the colloquy he suggested that I would do well if I took the suggestion of the conferees as to when they could conclude their labors. The chairman of the conference committee within the last 5 minuntes said that the conferees expected to finish the conference report on Saturday of this week.

Therefore, I am not particularly concerned about whom I am criticizing. I am criticizing the fact that because we are going into an Easter recess, it looks as though we will have a week's delay in acting on the conference report, on the basis of the estimate made by the chairman of the conference committee, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], for whom I have such an abundance of respect and in whom I have such great confidence.

Therefore, I merely say that while the farmers of America are compelled to wait and wonder about their future, I do not believe we should be in recess, when we could, perhaps, gain a week's time by staying here and taking our recess at a later date.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I believe the RECORD is abundantly clear to the members of the Senator's own party—and I think the Senator from South Dakota was aware of it before he made his statement, and I believe his own leader is aware of the fact—that nothing would be gained by staying here next week. The conference report, when it is filed and is ready for action, will establish the fact that the Senator is aware of it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I do not believe that next week will be wasted. I have conferred with the farmers of my State. I conferred with them when I was home.

The Senate version of the bill is entirely different from what they expected. I know I have already scheduled not 1, but 5 meetings in my State with farmers, and I want to discuss with them the farm situation and then come back with their opinions. Therefore, I do not believe the time next week will be wasted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas has been around the Capitol long enough to know that we can always expect at least one speech along the line of the speech made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. Therefore, in anticipation of that speech I went to the minority leader and said, "We are likely to be confronted with this kind of situation." After consulting with the minority leader I went to the Speaker of the House and the majority leader of the House, both of whom conferred with the minority leader of the House. Then after that I had numerous conferences with the chairman of the conference committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

I assured him that we would be glad to stay here on Saturday night and on Monday or Tuesday or Wednesday, or at any time, if we needed to do so in order to get the conference report acted on. However, it must be remembered that the conference report is not just a report to the Senate or just the report of one Senator. It is the report of two groups. What do the conferees say about it? I should like to read what the very able Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN said yesterday:

> Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding to me.
>
> It is quite obvious that if we are to secure a good farm bill it will take time on the part of the conferees. I am one of the conferees. I can assure the gentleman there are a great many disagreements between the House and the Senate bill which we must discuss. I am foregoing any Easter vacation, like my chairman, so that we can be here to sit down and try to work out a good, sound farm bill that will receive the approval of the Congress. I may not agree to everything that is agreed to in the committee of conference; nevertheless, I feel that we must have a farm bill at the present time. The time is short, so I am going to stay here to work on the committee and get a bill out of the conference,

in the hope that we can vote on it when the recess is over.

Mr. COOLEY. I should like to know whether the gentleman agrees with me in the statement I made a minute ago. Although we have worked faithfully and diligently and long hours, does the gentleman think it is even humanly possible for us to reach an agreement, prepare a bill, prepare a conference report, and have it back here before the Easter recess?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am in accord with the chairman, because I do not think that with all the knowledge we have here we could sit down and analyze every Senate amendment and be able to explain it to the House unless we have ample time to do it.

The Speaker of the House subsequently said:

Mr. RAYBURN. I want to propound this inquiry to the gentleman from North Carolina. I realize that the gentleman has a colossal job and I hope you do it thoroughly. I know it cannot be done hurriedly. That is just one thing that is absolutely certain because with 38 amendments and with deep differences between many of the conferees, it would seem to me that it would be a practical impossibility to even come to an agreement this week even if the conferees sat until Saturday. Then, also, with a complicated bill like this, the staff of the committee must go to work and seek to bring in a report explaining the bill so that the House can understand it. Does not the gentleman think that even that would take several days?

The chairman agreed with him.

Mr. President, the conference report has got to be participated in by the House. It has got to be acted on first by the House. The majority leader and the minority leader of the Senate were informed by the leadership of the other body that the conference report could not be available today and that they were asking the members of the conference committee to sit all week to try to make the report available. For that reason we expect to go through with our previous plans. If, by setting those plans aside, we could get a farm bill 1 hour earlier, I am sure I speak for the minority leader in saying that we would be glad to do it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, when the majority leader inquired of me the other day as to whether I would be prepared to join with him in keeping the Senate in session to a late hour on Thursday, or even extending the period of the recess, if we could complete the farm bill, I told him he would have full cooperation on this side of the asile to complete action on the farm bill if it were at all possible to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I even went so far as to talk to some of the House conferees and ask them if they would not sit late into the evening. They are practical men, Mr. President. The Senate took days and days and weeks and weeks in discussing the farm bill. People who live in glass houses should not throw stones, and it ill behooves anyone to criticize the fact that there is a brief delay of a few days when it took the Senate weeks to act on the bill. It was not just the fault of the majority side; it was the fault of the minority side, too. I dislike to have the impression go out that we are not concerned with the farmers' interest. I thought the bill would be ready if the conference committee stayed in session, as did the Speaker, the majority and minority leaders of the House, and the House conferees, and everyone except the Senator from Louisiana, who, I think, has grave doubts himself. When he first came to us, he thought the conference report would be ready, but there are still some 38 amendments which have not been touched.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show that I had complete confidence in the accuracy of the prediction of the chairman of the conference committee [Mr. ELLENDER] that we could complete action by Saturday night. If that had been true, we could have acted upon the report on Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas is not speaking for the Senator from Louisiana, but if the Senator from South Dakota will read the RECORD, I think he will see that action is not going to be completed by Saturday night. The Senator from Louisiana thought it would be completed by Wednesday night, but he was very optimistic. We cannot expect the House conferees to take 38 amendments and put them all into a suitcase and say they are going to take them all. They want to examine them thoroughly. I think they do themselves credit and do the legislative body of the United States credit when they cancel their own vacation to stay here and work on the conference report.

TRADE WITH LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wish to take just a moment to congratulate the junior Senator from Missouri and the fine Kansas City group of civic, business and professional leaders on their recent good-will trip to various Latin American countries.

The distinguished Senator has rendered a great service in bringing this new idea of promoting better understanding with our friends and neighbors to the south to the attention of the Senate.

I believe every one of us recognizes that as our trade with European and Asian countries diminishes, the United States of America must look to the countries in Central America and South America for their future economic welfare. The Latin American nations are rapidly growing to the extent that it is estimated they will have 300 million people by 1975. Theirs is an area of the world which is fertile for development of natural resources needed by these United States. They in turn need the things we make and need extended credit with which to purchase them. I think it is an excellent idea which was put forward by the Kansas City group; namely, getting civic, business, and professional leaders together and making a trip to those countries to try to encourage and promote trade with our Latin American neighbors. These ambassadors of good will certainly did an excellent job and should most definitely be encouraged to do it again next year. I trust that their idea will receive the serious attention of other civic, business, and professional leaders throughout this fair land of ours.

INTERFERENCE BY WHITE HOUSE AND REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE IN PRIMARY ELECTION PROCESS IN OREGON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized for 8 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Oregon is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, there have been few more glaring examples of White House interference in a senatorial contest in an individual State than what recently occurred in my home State of Oregon.

This intrusion by the present White House hierarchy makes pallid and mild by comparison any participation in a State race that took place under the Presidency of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I say this, Mr. President, even though I am aware of the fact that the distinguished occupant of the chair, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], was once the object of the intervention in a State campaign by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in the Democratic primary in Georgia in 1938.

It does not take a long memory to remember how Mr. Roosevelt was denounced as a dictator and as the author of "purges" because he occasionally indicated a preference for one or another candidate in a Democratic Party primary somewhere in the Nation.

But no intervention which President Roosevelt ever sanctioned could compare even remotely with the ruthless brushing aside of the Republican Party in Oregon by the White House staff and the Republican National Committee when they recently dropped Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay into the Oregon Republican senatorial primary.

Already entered in that primary were four candidates. These men were not even notified that the White House was interjecting McKay into the race. Yet Oregon's leading Republican newspaper is authority for the fact that Mr. McKay expected these other candidates to step aside for him, to withdraw abjectly from the election in his favor. Mr. President, did any intervention in a primary ever occur under Franklin D. Roosevelt which could even get close enough to this ruthless intervention to communicate with it by smoke signals? I doubt it, Mr. President. This intrusion by the White House and by Mr. McKay is in a class by itself.

President Roosevelt was accused of wanting a rubber-stamp Congress because of his several forays into some Democratic Party primaries. What would have been said, Mr. President, had President Roosevelt at the 11th hour dispatched a Cabinet member to a party primary in a sovereign State of

the Union without so much as a moment's notice to the faithful party members already enlisted in that primary and then had expected these men to withdraw cringingly in favor of the White House entry?

Had President Roosevelt done anything like that, Mr. President, he would have been compared with every dictator from Atilla the Hun to Benito Mussolini, and more besides.

Let me read two paragraphs from the March 10, 1956, issue of the Portland Oregonian, a newspaper completely Republican in its editorial allegiance:

It was obvious when the Secretary and Mrs. McKay slipped in unannounced by United Airliner just after midnight that they thought the national committee had paved the way—that all candidates would withdraw to make way for McKay.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator reading a quotation from the Portland Oregonian?

Mr. NEUBERGER. It is an exact quotation from the Portland, Oreg., Oregonian. I continue to read:

It quickly developed, however, that the way had not been paved. Even top Republican brass in the State did not know he was coming. Neither did Lamar Tooze nor Phil Hitchcock, 2 of the 4 announced candidates for the nomination.

State Senator Hitchcock added the candid comment, in the columns of the Oregonian, that "Secretary McKay's decision comes a complete surprise to me."

Just imagine what transpired, Mr. President. A little group of men in the White House and the Republican National Committee handpicked a Republican senatorial candidate for the State of Oregon. Then they sent him off to Oregon, without so much as a courtesy notice to the Republicans already filed in that race—all this on the eve of the closing of filings. And, furthermore, this vine-ripened specimen from the hothouses of the GOP National Committee confidently anticipated that the other nominees would back out of the race, merely at the signal that the White House and Leonard Hall had decided whom the Republicans of Oregon should nominate.

Nothing that I can say about this ruthless intervention in the Oregon primary, Mr. President, can be as caustic as the recent statement of State Senator Lowell Steen of Umatilla County, a Republican member of the State legislature. Senator Steen is a regular Republican leader who supported my opponent in the 1954 senatorial election, but listen to his comments concerning the White House-Leonard Hall blitzkrieg on Oregon's primary election processes. This is what Senator Steen declared:

The issue in the May 18 primary election is whether the Republicans will pick their own candidate or let the national Republican Party organization dictate who the candidate will be.

There has also been comment on the manner in which Mr. McKay, at the last moment, was injected into the Oregon senatorial race by the White House and the national leadership of the Republican Party. Let me quote, for example, the editorial reaction from the Oregon Statesman, published in our State capital city by a former Republican governor of my State and a nationally known figure, Mr. Charles A. Sprague:

McKay was free to become a candidate even though on numerous occasions he had rejected the idea of standing against MORSE. The Statesman, however, objects to the commissioning of a candidate by the Republican national chairman or by the White House as was done with McKay, to the extent of having a special letter of commendation written by the President. It protests also to the way the maneuver was handled with no contact, so far as has been admitted, with party leaders in Oregon. This worked to McKay's embarrassment when he arrived Friday and certainly was embarrassing to State Chairman Wendell Wyatt. We think Hitchcock should stay in the race both because of his splendid qualifications and to repudiate the notion that Oregon is a province of the GOP GHQ.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Statesman of March 15, 1956]

HITCHCOCK REMAINS A CANDIDATE

Phil Hitchcock has decided not to withdraw as candidate for the Republican nomination for United States Senator. Pressures were put on him to pull out of the contest after Secretary McKay announced his entry. Hitchcock concluded that having entered the contest in good faith and at the urging of many Republicans he should stay in the race.

The Statesman commends Hitchcock for his decision. He is a man eminently qualified for the office he seeks. He was under no obligation, political or moral, to step aside. On the contrary those who had urged him to enter are the ones who are under obligation to continue their support.

As for McKay, the Oregon primary is open to all who want to run for office in the party to which they adhere. McKay was free to become a candidate even though on numerous occasions he had rejected the idea of standing against MORSE. The Statesman, however, objects to the commissioning of a candidate by the Republican national chairman or by the White House as was done with McKay, to the extent of having a special letter of commendation written by the President. It protests also to the way the maneuver was handled with no contact, so far as has been admitted, with party leaders in Oregon. This worked to McKay's embarrassment when he arrived Friday and certainly was embarrassing to State Chairman Wendell Wyatt. We think Hitchcock should stay in the race both because of his splendid qualifications and to repudiate the notion that Oregon is a province of the GOP GHQ.

The argument offered to support the shift to McKay was that he will be the strongest candidate the party can put up to contest with MORSE. Whether this is correct, of course, only time will tell. If McKay is the nominee then the issue becomes one of vindicating McKay and the McKay policies as Secretary of the Interior. Republicans are thus thrown on the defensive. With another candidate the issues are not so tightly narrowed, and MORSE is the one put on the defensive.

Much is made of support for the Eisenhower policies. Hitchcock has already made it clear that he supports Eisenhower and his program. But the latter is much broader than the policies of the Interior Department. It embraces foreign affairs, maintaining a high level of prosperity without inflation, revision of farm legislation, expansion of Federal aid to highways, Federal aid for school construction, etc. The campaign in Oregon should not be bogged down with justifications for Al Serena mining claims, Hells Canyon, and tidelands grant to States. These appear to be settled issues, and while their wisdom may become part of the political debate, as was the case in 1954, the Republican campaign in Oregon needs to be conducted on a much broader basis. For that reason the Statesman feels that the Republican Party should draw on fresh material, especially where there is available a man of Hitchcock's character and ability.

It will be a mistake for the Republican Party in Oregon to let the effort to defeat MORSE absorb all its energy. There is a whole slate of offices to fill, especially at the State level, and members to be elected to the legislative assembly as well as to the State decision on the presidental ticket. So Republican electors should do some hard thinking before casting their ballots on the senatorial nominees.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was not former Governor Sprague appointed either as a delegate or alternative delegate to the United Nations?

Mr. NEUBERGER. He was, indeed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is he not one of the most distinguished citizens of Oregon?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The name of former Governor Sprague has won more high journalistic honors, if my memory serves me correctly, than has any other journalist in the modern history of Oregon.

This is what ex-Governor Sprague said, in part, about the entry into the Oregon primary race of his fellow townsman of the city of Salem, a fellow Republican, and a fellow former governor of Oregon, Mr. McKay:

McKay was free to become a candidate even though on numerous occasions he had rejected the idea of standing against MORSE. The Statesman, however, objects to the commissioning of a candidate by the Republican national chairman or by the White House as was done with McKay, to the extent of having a special letter of commendation written by the President. It protests also to the way the maneuver was handled with no contact, so far as had been admitted, with party leaders in Oregon.

This worked to McKay's embarrassment when he arrived Friday and certainly was embarrassing to State Chairman Wendell Wyatt. We think Hitchcock should stay in the race both because of his splendid qualifications and to repudiate the notion that Oregon is a province of the GOP GHQ.

Mr. Hitchcock is the man I mentioned earlier.

Mr. President, those are not the words of a Democratic Senator; they are the words of a leading Republican, a former governor of Oregon, the foremost Republican editor in the State, who, I might add parenthetically, opposed the present junior Senator from Oregon editorially when I was a candidate in 1954.

The passage of a couple of weeks since Senator McKay's last-minute announcement of his candidacy for the Republican nomination for Senator from Ore-

gon has afforded an opportunity for other press comments and assessments of the situation created by this sudden step. I believe some of these press comments will be of interest to Senators, and I am making them available by inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today.

For example, the Denver Post, published by Mr. E. P. Hoyt, who used to publish the Portland Oregonian—and both of these newspapers supported the Republican ticket in 1952—commented in an editorial on March 12, 1956:

Secretary of the Interior McKay's departure from the Eisenhower Cabinet to contest the Senate seat held by Oregon's Republican-turned-Democrat WAYNE L. MORSE, will be no loss to the President or to the country. Nor will it, in our opinion, frighten the Democrats of Oregon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. MCKAY STEPS DOWN

Secretary of the Interior McKay's departure from the Eisenhower Cabinet to contest the Senate seat held by Oregon's Republican-turned-Democrat, WAYNE L. MORSE, will be no loss to the President or to the country. Nor will it, in our opinion, frighten the Democrats of Oregon, even though the GOP has worked up a real boil on Mr. MORSE who bolted the party which elected him to two terms.

Mr. McKay was a popular legislator and two-term Governor of Oregon. A Salem, Oreg., automobile dealer, member of a pioneer family and a doughty little Scotchman with folksy ways and a good World War I record, Mr. McKay got along fine in the politics of the Beaver State. But when he was pulled into the national spotlight and given command of the explosive and angrily denounced affairs of Interior, Mr. McKay flopped futilely around like a Columbia River Chinook salmon on the cannery floor.

Mr. McKay had worked persistently for flood control on the Willamette River which courses through Salem and occasionally bursts its banks. But he either had insufficient knowledge about the economics of great reclamation and power projects in the West, or he was forced into subscribing to fuzzy and phony compromises in setting policy for future Federal investments in land and water developments. And after 3 years Mr. McKay found himself wholly on the defensive in such matters as the relocation of Indians, the so-called partnership in generating hydroelectric power, the granting of mineral leases in wildlife refuges and the giveaway of public timber by misuse of the mining laws.

Even when the Secretary was not wrong in principle, he was terribly inept in proving that he was right. And during 3 years as Secretary of the Interior he became identified with retrenchment, retreat, and apology in prosecuting the functions of this great western agency, rather than advocacy of legitimate public works which contributed to western prosperity and national security in the 20 years preceding his regime.

We said once before, in suggesting Mr. McKay's retirement, that he was a man of courage, honor, and decent instincts. But he was, to, a small man in a big job—a job demanding vision and imagination as the supplements of courage, and a real deep-down belief in the economic role of the West in the drama of an expanding nation. Perhaps Mr. McKay was restrained by the unsympathetic influences in the administration he served. More likely, he went along without discriminating between what was good for the West and what was good for the Republican Party.

Mr. Eisenhower's firm and successful prosecution of the upper Colorado River storage, reclamation and power project provides him with an opportunity to free Mr. McKay's successor in championing public works without the self-imposed inhibitions and fears about socialism. That makes it rather important that Ike name a Secretary who is not publicly identified with parroting such groundless fears to the expense of public works that cannot and will not be undertaken by misnamed free private enterprise.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Oregon was the first State to adopt a system for the direct election of United States Senators. It was one of the first States to have a direct primary election. If Oregon Republicans permit their primary to be perverted and dominated by absentee dictation from 3,000 miles away, then the primary election system is as dead as the mastodon, so far as Oregon Republicans are concerned.

Already one Republican candidate has withdrawn—General Tooze. This was done because Mr. McKay entered the race. Of course, this is the privilege of the man who withdrew, just as it was his privilege to enter the contest originally. But when, Mr. President, has there been such an example of gross and outright interference in a primary contest by the highest political echelons of a major party, as the Republican Party has done in the Oregon Republican senatorial contest?

Of course, Mr. President, I am not privy to the innermost secrets of the Republican Party. Therefore, I do not know whether the White House superimposed its will on the Oregon primary election because it wanted to eliminate from the Cabinet a man who has become a national symbol of giving away water-power sites, national-forest timber, and wildlife refuges, or whether the White House actually felt that Mr. McKay has any real chance of election against the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The latter supposition is so remote from the truth that perhaps the former assumption is correct. It may have been that this entire invasion of a party primary was merely undertaken in order to rid the President's Cabinet of a man who is now anathema to the millions of Americans who are dedicated to true conservation of our natural resources.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was it not the practice in the former German Empire that if a figure around the court of Kaiser Wilhelm became unpopular he was sent to the most dangerous portion of the western front?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I think it might be said that Secretary McKay was sent to the front; and when I consider the high esteem in which the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is held by the people of Oregon, it might be said that Mr. McKay has been sent to a dangerous sector of the front, as the distinguished Senator from Illinois has said.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was interested in what the Senator had to say about the GOP–GHQ.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I did not say that; a distinguished former Republican governor of Oregon said it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand that it was not said by the junior Senator from Oregon, but was said by a man who used to be a Republican governor in what used to be called the Republican State of Oregon.

But I am interested in the power exercised and displayed by the praetorian guard in the White House. They seem to be arrogating unto themselves a great deal of power in more ways than one; not only arrogating to themselves power in legislative matters, but also in the matter of subordinating the legislative branch at the same time.

Mr. McKay has a reputation for giving away the natural resources of the American people. Perhaps what the Republican GHQ had in mind was giving Mr. McKay away. But if that is the way it is going to work it is going to be a good thing for McKay, because he will not win against Senator MORSE. It will be a good thing for the country, because he will be out of his position, which he has used ruthlessly in the last 3 years in giving away the Nation's resources and in retarding the development of the country.

As a matter of fact, it would appear that Mr. McKay has outlived his "uselessness."

Mr. NEUBERGER. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Montana that he is certainly right. It is a good thing for America to have Mr. McKay out of the Cabinet, because of his policies of giving away our resources. It is a good thing for the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to have Mr. McKay as an opponent. The only possible circumstance for which it is bad is the freedom of Republican primary elections in the State of Oregon.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The junior Senator from Oregon is a former member of the Oregon State Legislature. I wonder if the Senator knows of any law during his time of service, or of any law that has been passed any time since, which repealed the primary laws of the State of Oregon. They are still on the books, are they not?

Mr. NEUBERGER. They are still on the books, to my knowledge.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oregonians have a peculiarly historic right to be proud, being members of the first State in the Union which had direct election of Senators, and they have pride in the freedom of being able to go into primaries and pick their own candidates in a given party. Is that correct?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Would the Senator say some of that spirit which has emanated from Oregon has gone across the Columbia River to the north, too?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The people in the State of Washington, I am sure, will resent just as much as will the people in the State of Oregon, any intrusion by the White House, or by "GHQ of the GOP," into the primary elections in the State of Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator and I think the people of the States of Oregon and Washington still adhere to the position—the Senator has had wide experience in both States—that we have primaries for a reason. The reason is that the people may pick the candidates in the various political parties. Then if the "GHQ" wants to say, "We are for the Republican nominee," the people will say, "That is only politically natural."

Will the Senator agree with me that we have had a lot of talk around the Senate in the last few weeks about campaign moneys and campaign contributions? The Senator knows, having freshly come from a campaign, that it costs considerable money to run a campaign, even in a State like Oregon or Washington, or States similarly populated. Would the Senator think that not only has the "GHQ" suggested, or pretended to suggest, to the people of Oregon that they can anoint a candidate, but it also may suggest that they might finance him after they have anointed him?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I take the suggestion of the senior Senator from Washington to be true.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And most of the financing will come, not from the people of Oregon, but from people outside the State of Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Undoubtedly, what the senior Senator from Washington says is entirely correct. I should like to emphasize to the senior Senator from Washington, who has raised this point, that the Portland Oregonian, a newspaper with which the senior Senator from Washington is familiar, because it has a large circulation in the western portion of Washington—and it is a Republican newspaper—stated as follows, and again I want to read these two sentences to show how ruthlessly Mr. McKay was superimposed on the Oregon primaries:

It was obvious when the Secretary and Mrs. McKay slipped in unannounced by United Airlines just after midnight—

This was just before the time for filing would close—

that they thought the national committee had paved the way, that all candidates would withdraw to make way for McKay.

It quickly developed, however, that the way had not been paved. Even top Republican brass in the State did not know he was coming.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is it not true that several statements had been prepared the day before, and had been given to various persons throughout the Government, including Members of Congress, to be read at noon, announcing what a great man the Secretary of the Interior was, and that they had to withhold those statements because something happened out there? They were already to read them at noon. The statements were prepared before the announcement was made that he was going to file. They had to wait until about 3 or 4 o'clock until they had word from the "western front" what had happened.

Mr. NEUBERGER. All I can say to the distinguished senior Senator from Washington is that evidently the statements were not transmitted to Oregon, because several of the Republican nominees, I might say, quite courageously and impudently, stayed in the race, and they are running against Mr. McKay. They are actually running against him. His resignation has just been submitted as Secretary of the Interior, evidently indicating he feels some sense of emergency has arisen.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As long as the Portland Oregonian referred to the GHQ of the GOP——

Mr. NEUBERGER. That was the Oregon Statesman.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder if they meant the headquarters of the Republican National Committee, which is listed in the Washington telephone book as 1625 I Street, or whether they meant 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Not having access to the innermost thinking processes of our distinguished ex-Republican governor, I would not know, but perhaps he might have referred to both of them, because evidently it was a calculated move.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Referring to what the Senator from Illinois has said, did it not come to be quite a common practice during the war to have what was known as a combined GHQ?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I did not remember it until the distinguished Senator from Montana reminded me of it, but, of course, that is so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think it will take a combined GHQ to put Mr. McKay over. He will have to get a little more in the way of sustenance than he has so far. I am not referring to finances. He will have to have a combined GHQ to fall back on after the election is over.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am sure it will be necessary for him, if he survives the primaries.

Mr. President, it is none of my business who wins the Republican primary in Oregon May 18. The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will be reelected in November, regardless of the identity of his opponent. But the primary-election system in our State belongs to no party, be it Republican or Democratic. It belongs to the people, the descendants of those long-gone pioneers of political reform in Oregon who resisted fear and caution to give the voters the right to pick their own nominees at the polls.

What happened in our State March 9, when the White House and the Republican National Committee imposed their will on the Oregon primary system, was not democracy and it was not in the interest of good government. As one who heard Franklin D. Roosevelt being roundly criticized for so much milder and less overt intrusion into primary elections, I still am waiting for some words to be said, Mr. President, about purges and dictatorship and interference in State elections on the part of this administration.

Or, Mr. President, have we reached the stage where what is sauce for the goose actually is not sauce for the gander? Can the present administration act to choke off and muffle a primary election, as Secretary McKay evidently hoped would happen in Oregon? Is it permissible for our current national political leaders to subvert a primary, by attempting to secure a clear field for their handpicked nominee, who suddenly is thrust into the State's nominating process from 3,000 miles away?

Mr. President, by way of conclusion, I am extremely happy that many of the distinguished editors of my State and of nearby States, such as Colorado, share the indignation that has been voiced on the floor of the Senate today over the intrusion by GHQ of the GOP into the Oregon Republican primaries.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks two excellent editorials from the Medford Mail Tribune of March 20, 1956, by a former winner of the Pulitzer prize for journalism, Mr. Robert W. Ruhl; and, also, an article by Mr. A. Robert Smith, which appeared in the Oregon Statesman of March 18, 1956, and an editorial from the Astorian Budget of March 12, 1956, and an article from the Oregonian of March 10, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Medford Mail Tribune of March 20, 1956]

WHAT PERSUADED MCKAY?

Who or what did persuade Secretary of the Interior McKay to agree to resign his Cabinet job and run against Senator WAYNE MORSE for the Upper House?

The general supposition at first was it must have been the President. But Secretary McKay has publicly denied this. He says in effect, no one persuaded him. He decided to run himself.

Yet as the Mail Tribune correspondent in Washington, A. Robert Smith brought out so clearly in Sunday's paper:

On Monday, March 5, in an hour's interview, Mr. McKay said he hoped to retire to his beloved Oregon, reiterating that he had no intention of running for MORSE's Senate seat, that at 62 he was too old to tackle that sort of a job, that a younger man should take over, etc., etc.

On the next Tuesday, March 6, Secretary McKay told the same story to an Associated Press representative. He said he would not make the Senate race, but unless the President wished him to remain in the Cabinet he would retire.

On the day following (Wednesday, the 7th), Secretary McKay was invited to breakfast by Leonard Hall, the dynamic GOP chairman, and the pressure was put on hard

from the standpoint that the defeat of WAYNE MORSE on the Republican agenda came second only in importance to a victory for Ike and that the Secretary was the one man to do it, Lamar Tooze and Phil Hitchcock, the other contenders being not well enough known in Oregon.

According to Correspondent Smith, although the pressure was considerable Secretary McKay was still unconvinced.

The next day, however, Mr. McKay was called to a conference at the White House. En route (again according to Reporter Smith), he told an AP reporter he was still opposed to making the race against MORSE. But presto, bingo—that afternoon, only a few hours later, Secretary and Mrs. McKay were on a plane en route to Salem, Oreg., and the following day the controversial Secretary of the Interior, did what he had maintained for weeks and only the day before, he would never do—entered the lists to kick his old-time enemy WAYNE MORSE out of the United States Senate and take the seat for the next 6 years himself.

Secretary McKay still stuck to his original story however, that President Eisenhower did not ask him to run, but was immensely pleased when Oregon's former governor told him he had decided to do so.

There is no reason to doubt this.

It comes down then, largely, to a matter of semantics.

No doubt the President did not put his arm around "Dear Doug's" shoulder and plead with him to make the race and thus save the GOP and the Nation. But his "alter ego," Sherman Adams probably did do something of the sort, so it was in reality the realization that his boss and revered leader wanted him to make the race, and would be sorely displeased and disappointed if he didn't, that as Reporter Smith expressed it: "Pushed McKay into a campaign he personally did not wish to enter."

R. W. R.

HE REFUSES TO QUIT

There was a second big surprise in this all-out GOP effort to "get" WAYNE MORSE—or else.

It was assumed in Washington that Messrs. Tooze and Hitchcock would meekly acquiesce and when they got word from "on high" that Secretary McKay had been properly chosen and anointed, they would fold up their tents and quietly sneak away.

Attorney Tooze did so. But former State Senator Hitchcock appeared to be made of sterner stuff.

At any rate, on his visit here Mr. Hitchcock assured his friends and supporters he was in the race to stay. He believed he had a better chance of beating Oregon's senior Senator than the vulnerable and reactionary Secretary of the Interior, and that in justice to those who believed as he did, he would not, regardless of what pressure might be brought, obey the command to quit and retreat, even if it were issued from GHQ or thereabouts.

Win, lose, or draw, Candidate Hitchcock is to be commended for his spirit and independence.

More than that, he will find plenty of support among Republicans for his contention that he would give WAYNE MORSE a harder run for his money than the Secretary of the Interior.

For all the true TR conservationists are not in the Democratic Party by any means. Nor are all the advocates of public power over private power at Hells Canyon or at similar multiple project. Thousands of liberal Republicans particularly here in the Northwest are as critical of the Interior Department's record under McKay as any of the Democrats, and while probably few of them would like to vote for WAYNE MORSE, not many of them would vote for 6 more years of McKay giveaway doctrine in the United States Senate—or anywhere else either.

So while as things now stand it isn't probable, it is possible, that young Hitchcock may pull one of the big upsets of the campaign and thus allow Secretary McKay to do what he really wants to do—retire from public life and hand over the job of carrying the torch for the Grand Old Party to younger and more eager hands.

R. W. R.

[From the Oregon Statesman of March 18, 1956]

RECONSTRUCTED STORY SHOWS VITAL ROLE OF IKE'S ADVISERS IN DECISION BY SECRETARY MCKAY

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—The sudden decision of Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay to pull out of the Cabinet and run for the Senate in Oregon was brought about in a matter of hours by President Eisenhower's top political advisers, if not by the President himself.

This is the reconstructed background story, as completely as it could be pieced together, of this major political development.

Monday, March 5, in an hour-long interview with McKay that afternoon in his office, he told me he had no plans for the future except to resign next January 20 and let the President decide whether he wanted to make a Cabinet change. Either way would have been O. K. with McKay, for he said he was looking forward to retiring. In previous interviews, McKay said he had no desire to run for the Senate, explaining that a man younger than his 62 years should be tackling that job.

McKay seemed relaxed, genial as ever, and profiting personally from the philosophy he applies to his controversy-ridden job. No matter how thick the brickbats might fly, "I never go to sleep at night mad at anyone," he said.

In the month since the late Governor Patterson died, he had been urged by many to return to Oregon and take on Senator WAYNE MORSE. He had held out adamantly against this idea. Mrs. McKay was even more stoutly opposed to it. Up to this day, no one had successfully moved either from that position.

Tuesday, March 6: McKay told an inquiring reporter for the Associated Press substantially what he had told me Monday about his future plans.

Wednesday, March 7: McKay had breakfast with Leonard Hall, GOP national chairman. From this point the wheels began grinding furiously. Hall reportedly told McKay that a public opinion firm hired by the Republican National Committee had taken a sampling in Oregon and found McKay much better known by the average citizen than either Phil Hitchcock or Lamar Tooze, the two main Republican contenders for MORSE's seat. The day before, Hall told 1,500 ladies attending the National Republican Women's Conference here that MORSE was a prime GOP target, next in importance to the Presidency in this year's elections. Party leaders didn't want to take a chance on a relatively unknown candidate. McKay was told they thought he was the man to do the job.

McKay left the breakfast table unconvinced. During the day he sounded out close advisers. Some encouraged him to run. He said he would have to talk it over with Mrs. McKay that night. That same evening, Attorney General Herbert Brownell told a prominent Republican that despite the heat on McKay to run, he was still dragging his feet. Brownell said he was confident McKay would change his mind by the following day. He explained that an 11 o'clock appointment set up by the White House for McKay with the President the following morning would cinch the matter if McKay were still holding out when he arrived at the White House.

In this conversation, Brownell, who is one of the administration's top political masterminds, explained that party political leaders here felt that McKay had not made a satisfactory recovery from the political onslaught of the Democrats on the giveaway charge. Other Cabinet members, placed on the hot seat by partisan critics, had recovered much better, Brownell added, mentioning Defense Secretary Wilson.

This was clearly not the attitude of many western Republicans, such as Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah, who had come to regard McKay very highly and defended him frequently on the Senate floor. There was no apparent organized effort from the West, where Interior policies are most vital, to replace McKay before the campaign got under way. Indeed, Mountain State Republicans feel they are riding high now, having won congressional approval of the McKay supported upper Colorado project—second highest Federal reclamation project ever proposed by Congress.

Thursday, March 8: McKay went to the White House that morning. A top Republican told the AP that before he arrived he was still determined not to run. In any case, by late afternoon he was aboard a flight bound for Portland with a hastily prepared statement explaining his decision to oppose MORSE. McKay said he was not urged by Eisenhower himself to run, but that Sherman Adams, the President's chief assistant, encouraged him to do so and it pleased the President when he told him of his decision. That day Eisenhower wrote McKay a letter, saying his decision was worthy of the highest commendation.

Friday, March 9: McKay invited Hitchcock and Tooze to a morning confab to discuss his sudden entry into the race. Both, because he had been led to believe by party bigwigs in Washington that Tooze and Hitchcock had agreed to withdraw if he entered the race; Tooze and Hitchcock because no one had even mentioned it to them.

When the news leaked out about what was afoot, McKay told reporters there was some confusion and he didn't know whether he would run or not. This was flashed to Washington, and in turn the White House got on the phone to McKay and Ralph Cake, former GOP national committeeman. Adams and Hall were on the White House end of the line to see about ending the confusion. Shortly thereafter, McKay announced he was in the race, he drove to Salem to file, and the White House formally announced the news here.

Available evidence points to the conclusion that McKay was pushed into a campaign he personally did not wish to enter, by party officials at the Washington level who led him to believe he was the strongest of possible challengers for MORSE, that other Oregon candidates would welcome his candidacy and pull out (although they were not consulted) and that he would be doing what the President and the party most wanted him to do if he knocked off WAYNE MORSE.

Motivating at least some of this pressure on McKay was a feeling held by some of the GOP's top strategists here that McKay had not been able to combat his Democratic critics as effectively as they might have wished and that it would be no less politically valuable to have a new Secretary of the Interior as the 1956 campaign got under way than to have McKay barnstorming up and down his native Oregon after the scalp of his harshest critic.

[From the Evening Astorian-Budget of March 12, 1956]

LIVELY FIGHT AHEAD

There's certainly new life in the political situation this week with Interior Secretary Douglas McKay's dramatic entrance into

the contest for Senator WAYNE MORSE's senatorial seat.

The resignation of a Cabinet member to enter a senatorial contest is highly unusual in United States politics.

When that Cabinet member has been the principal target of criticisms of a major administration policy—the handling of Northwest power development—and when his opponent for the Senate seat is a leading critic of that policy, obviously the issue for the campaign is drawn clearly.

We will have a real rouser of a campaign battle, it seems safe to predict, with full dress debate of the administration's "partnership" power policy versus the policy of full Federal development of power as advocated by Senator MORSE and the Democrats.

The outcome will clearly be of interest to the whole Nation as well as to Oregon and the Northwest, because it is such a showdown test of the administration's standing with the people of the Northwest on the power situation.

Whether one agrees with McKay's opinions or not, one must credit him with political courage in staking his political future and the administration's reputation in a tough political battle of doubtful outcome.

Senator MORSE is a competent campaigner, with few equals in skill at extemporaneous, rough and tumble debating. Any one who takes him on is in for a tough time. He had intimated quite often that there is nothing he would rather do than take on McKay in a campaign.

Well, he has his chance. There's no need to say that it will be an interesting campaign.

[From the Oregonian of March 10, 1956]

IKE'S BLESSING GOES TO DOUG FOR CAMPAIGN—INTERIOR BOSS' LAST-MINUTE FILING SEEN AS GOP MOVE TO BEAT MORSE

Douglas McKay, 62, Secretary of Interior, flew to Oregon Friday to enter the race for United States Senator with the blessing of President Eisenhower.

McKay's last-minute entry was an admitted attempt by the Republican National Committee to beat Senator WAYNE MORSE, Republican-turned-Democrat, whose defeat probably is second only to the reelection of President Eisenhower on the party's priority list.

McKay said President Eisenhower had not personally urged him to make the race. But the President specifically gave McKay his personal blessing in a letter dated Wednesday, March 8, and released by Murray Snyder, assistant Presidential secretary at the White House Friday simultaneously with McKay's formal announcement that he would file for the Republican nomination.

In a statement announcing his candidacy, McKay said:

"I am coming back home to bring to a showdown in Oregon the question of whether the President's program is to be jeopardized in the future, as it has been in the past, by those seeking personal gratification and notoriety at the expense of the national welfare. The plain fact is that I believe my native State is not now represented by a Senator whose political integrity can be relied upon."

DECISION HELD WORTHY

President Eisenhower wrote:

"Your decision to campaign for election to the United States Senate from your beloved State of Oregon is worthy of the highest commendation.

"The vast experience you have gained in private life, as a veteran State legislator, governor, and able administrator of the vital affairs of the Department of the Interior, qualifies you for legislative judgments that will be of the utmost importance, not only to the people of Oregon, but to the remainder of the Nation as well.

"As a personal matter, of course, I have mingled emotions. You have been a tremendous asset to us in the Cabinet and you will be missed. At the same time it is easy to understand your desire to be of maximum personal service to your home State," the President added. "As a Member of the United States Senate you will add a great deal to the working strength we need and must have in order to carry out the objectives of the administration."

McKay told the Oregonian Friday morning that up to Monday he had laughed at any suggestion he run for the Senate against MORSE. He said it was the Republican National Committee which importuned him to make the race.

TOOZE TO WITHDRAW

It was obvious when the Secretary and Mrs. McKay slipped in unannounced by United Airliner just after midnight that they thought the national committee had paved the way, that all candidates would withdraw to make way for McKay.

It quickly developed, however, that the way had not been paved. Even top Republican brass in the State did not know he was coming. Neither did Lamar Tooze nor Phil Hitchcock, 2 of the 4 announced candidates for the nomination.

Tooze by noon had indicated he would withdraw as soon as McKay actually filed. Hitchcock, ex-State senator, now public relations representative for Lewis and Clark College, has not indicated he will withdraw.

Friday afternoon he issued a statement declaring:

"Secretary McKay's decision comes as a complete surprise to me. Many people throughout the State have committed themselves to support me and I have committed myself to them to make the race. At this time I do not see how I could withdraw that commitment."

ACTIVE DRIVE PLEDGED

McKay, after conferring with Tooze, Hitchcock, and Republican Party leaders all morning, announced his candidacy at noon.

"I'm in," he told the Oregonian. "I propose to fight it out along the Eisenhower policy line."

In a formal statement issued as he left for Salem at 1:30 p. m. to file for the nomination he said:

"I am looking forward to active participation in the forthcoming battle for the principles and ideals of government that President Eisenhower and the Republican Party stand for."

McKay early indicated he had not expected to make a campaign in the State primary. He later explained that he would be in no position to do so. He has commitments as Secretary of the Interior, which will keep him busy throughout April and into May, he said.

"I will resign as soon as possible in view of my obligations to my Cabinet job, maybe June 1," he said.

IKE SAID "PLEASED"

While McKay emphasized that the President did not urge him to make the race against MORSE, the Secretary said he had reported to the President before leaving Washington, however, and said the President was "pleased."

McKay made it plain he is not fond of Washington, D. C.

"I want nothing better than to get back to Oregon and retire," he said. "I want to die in Oregon," he added with a grin.

He feels a duty to serve the Nation and the party, however, in whatever capacity he is needed, he indicated.

"It was 72 when we left Washington," he said. "But this weather still looks good to me," he added, ducking from a sudden dash of hail mixed with gobs of Oregon dew.

RETURN SET SUNDAY

Despite two sleepless nights of travel, McKay looked relaxed, fit and 45, rather than 62, Mrs. McKay, who travels with him, admitted the prospect of another 6 years in Washington did not fill her with glee.

McKay admitted, however, he would enjoy a good fight with MORSE, with whose philosophies he has frequently clashed. McKay plans to return to Washington Sunday. He leaves next Wednesday for a trip to the Virgin Islands.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following joint resolutions of the Senate:

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress;

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress; and

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8780) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9064) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2 and 3 to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following con-

current resolution (H. Con. Res. 226) establishing that when the two Houses adjourn Thursday, March 29, 1956, they stand adjourned until Monday, April 9, 1956, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, March 29, 1956, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 9, 1956.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 374. An act to authorize the adjustment and clarification of ownership to certain lands within the Stanislaus National Forest, Tuolumne County, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 1005. An act for the relief of Alice Duckett;

H. R. 1082. An act for the relief of Golda I. Stegner;

H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Porter;

H. R. 1855. An act to amend the act approved April 24, 1950, entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes.";

H. R. 1892. An act for the relief of Dr. Lu Ho Tung and his wife, Ching-hsi (nee Tsao) Tung;

H. R. 2946. An act for the relief of Eugene Dus;

H. R. 3233. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to make it a criminal offense to move or travel in interstate commerce with intent to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for arson;

H. R. 4039. An act for the relief of Julian, Dolores, Roldan, and Julian, Jr., Lizardo;

H. R. 5889. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the town of Savannah Beach, Tybee Island, Ga.;

H. R. 6421. An act for the relief of Roy Cowan and others;

H. R. 6461. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 6463. An act to ratify and confirm section 4539, Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945, section 1 (b), act 12, Session Laws of Hawaii 1951, and the sales of public lands consummated pursuant to the terms of said statutes;

H. R. 6574. An act to amend section 2 of title IV of the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 680), as amended;

H. R. 6807. An act to authorize the amendment of certain patents of Government lands containing restrictions as to use of such lands in the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 6808. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 6824. An act to authorize the amendment of the restrictive covenant on land patent No. 10,410, issued to Keoshi Matsunaga, his heirs or assigns, on July 20, 1936, and covering lot 48 of Ponahawai house lots, situated in the county of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 7236. An act to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to water conservation practices;

H. R. 8100. An act to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of Brazil;

H. R. 9166. An act to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates;

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to release reversionary right to improvements on a 3-acre tract in Orangeburg County, S. C.; and

H. J. Res. 464. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Fifth International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION IN THE CASES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 68) favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens, which were, on page 3, strike out line 3; on page 3, line 16, strike out "Veccirkas" and insert "Vecoirkas", and on page 6, after line 2, insert:

T-303059, Bartolini, Alberto.
8511-A-1274, Caramanlau, Gheorghe.
E-053084, Cepeda-Teran, Aurelio.
A-3042474, Chaykowski, Michael.
A-1427387, Chervinski, Charles.
E-89265, Chillemi, Giovanni.
A-5934786, Cimino, Jean.
0800-106472, Cobos, Tomas.
A-1459543, Cowart, Harry Fuller.
E-069328, Dem, Louise.
A-2888771, Drewnowski, Czeslaw.
A-1847251, Elber, Isadore.
A-5524604, Feldman, Pal.
A-4724104, Ferro, Pete.
A-2174885, Figiolia, Louis Jack.
A-3740609, Grado, Luigi Di.
A-4705290, Gutstein, Albert.
A-5343594, Holody, Martin.
A-2194350, Honkamaa, Charles.
A-3155214, Irla, Anthony Stanley.
A-3237162, Kalinovik, Alexander Paul.
A-1028748, Kaplan, Abraham.
A-2518778, Kashigian, Artin.
A-5918920, Kauth, Kurt Max.
A-3132325, Knowles, Ann Eirwen.
A-7858221, Kryczka, John.
A-5402770, Lamars, Pete.
A-3623367, Latarski, Sigmund.
A-4963675, Lukac, John.
A-2941249, Maneniskis, Joseph.
A-5151675, Matheson, Wilfred Laurier (William Matheson).
A-3017074, Medoway, Sam.
A-5987784, Napolitano, Giovanni Antonio.
E-070997, Novak, Bela.
A-5720885, Nowak, John.
A-3818026, Ostrashelski, Constantine.
E-083290, Pong, Soon.
A-8116357, Reed, John David.
A-4755643, Richter, Walter.
A-5753580, Rocco, Louis.
A-2671145, Rucienski, Aleksander.
2770-P-142631, Sandler, Josel David.
A-1853190, Sandor, Victor.
E-086512, Schwar, Klara.
0800-84629, Simon, Aurif.
A-5862381, Slater, Frank.
E-47365, Sosa-Paz, Luz.
2310-P-15457, Stagliano, Maria Calogera nee La Forte.
A-1840646, Torres, Jose Buenaventura.
A-1815668, Tuchet, Frank.
A-5490012, Veilleux, Joseph Charles.
A-4967148, Walonce, Stanley Francis.
A-2935138, Wilkas, Julius.
A-1704536, Ziegenhirt, Joseph Francisco.
A-3122325, Forsbacka, Johannes Alfred.
A-5967839, Hovanec, John.
A-1985254, Jurlin, Daniel D.
A-7485159, Keefe, Everett Vernon.
E-057815, Moreno-Aguilar, Conrado.
A-4727339, Proch, John Alexander.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, acting on behalf of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who happens to be absent at this time, I wish to state that on February 3 last the Senate agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, approving the granting of suspension of deportation of certain deportable aliens. On March 6, 1956, the House of Representatives agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 68 with amendments, to delete the name of one alien whose case has been withdrawn by the Attorney General, and to correct the spelling of one name. The resolution was further amended to add the names of certain aliens whose cases were previously approved and included in an earlier resolution by the Senate, and whose names were deleted from that resolution by the House of Representatives. Three additional cases which were being held for further study have also been approved and included in the resolution.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate Concurrent Resolution 68.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation, with the exception of the deletion to which the Senator from South Carolina has referred, the concurrent resolution, as amended by the House, amounts in effect, to a consolidation of certain measures dealing with aliens, which previously had been acted on favorably by the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is substantially the case.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to establish whether the Senate had previously acted upon the measures. If that is not the case, I would wish to have a little more time, in order to consult with Members of this side of the aisle.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, Mr. President; the Senate has already acted upon them; and the amendment merely makes the concurrent resolution conform with measures on which the Senate already has acted favorably, and sent to the House of Representatives.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Very well; I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

FERNANDA MILANI

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the admendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 101) for the relief of Fernanda Milani, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Fernanda Milani, Spirodon Karousatos, Romana Michelina Serini, Mojsze Hildeshaim, Ita Hildeshaim, Angel Feratero Madayag, Jirair Mazartzian, Gertrude Mazartzian, Mario Mazartzian, Santiago Landa Arrizabalaga, Pak-Chue Chan, Oi-Jen Tsin Chan (nee Tsin), Chee Tao Chan, and Wai May Chan, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of

this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on June 14, 1955, the Senate passed Senate bill 101, to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to the beneficiary. On February 21, 1956, the House of Representatives passed the bill with amendments to include the beneficiaries of seven similar individual Senate bills.

Inasmuch as the House amendments make no substantive changes but merely group several cases into one bill, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

ANA P. COSTES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 117) for the relief of Ana P. Costes, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ana P. Costes, Wolodymyr Krysko, Rosa Tomasina Maria Puglisi (Rosa Tomasina Maria Sano), Shima Shinohara, Hsi-Lin Tung, Ruth Min-Kwong Leung Tung, Sumie Legasse, Hava Shpak, A. A. Shpak, Sympcha Shpak, Richard Karl Hoffman, Marcelina Anderson, Gerassimo Troianos, Markos Demetrius Spanos, Maria Gabriella Byron (Maria Gabriella Michon), Dolores Maria Gandiaga, nee Seijo, Chang Ho Cho, Chia-Yi Jen (also known as Charles Jen), Catherine Samouris, Kerson Huang, Cirilo Jose, Meliton Topacio Tapawan, Alvaro A. Jose, Hedi Gertrude Spiecker, Vaclav Majer, Irma Majer, Vaclav Majer, Jr., and Chocura Yoshida, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on June 14, 1955, the Senate passed Senate bill 117, to grant the status of permanent resident in the United States to the beneficiary. On February 21, 1956, the House of Representatives passed the bill with amendments to include the beneficiaries of 20 similar individual Senate bills.

Inasmuch as the House amendments make no substantive changes but merely group several cases into one bill, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

INGEBORG C. KARDE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 213) for the relief of Mrs. Ingeborg C. Karde, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act Ingeborg C. Karde, Shigeko Nakamura, and Valdis Mikelsons shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this section of this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bonds, which may have been issued in the cases of Georges Demetelin, Athena Demetelin, Stanley William Wheatland, Mareanthe Baicou, and Peter Skole. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said persons shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Domenico Bompiani, Beri Denovi, Mervin Walter Ball, Gordon Thompson Brown, Edward White, Lily Elsie White, Doctor Klaus Hergt, and Stephen Fodo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens and to cancel deportation proceedings in the cases of certain aliens."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on July 22, 1955, the Senate passed Senate bill 213, to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to the beneficiary. On February 7, 1956, the House of Representatives passed the bill with amendments to include the beneficiaries of 13 individual Senate bills. One case included in the bill passed the Senate, to provide for restoration of the beneficiary's United States citizenship, but, as amended, provides for the granting of permanent residence. Two cases which passed the Senate, to grant permanent residence to the beneficiaries, have been included in Senate bill 213, to provide for the cancellation of outstanding deportation proceedings.

The amendments are acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate bill 213.

The motion was agreed to.

ASHER EZRACHI

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 315) for the relief of Asher Ezrachi which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Asher Ezrachi and Ralph Piccolo (Raffaele Piccolo) may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (1) and (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Bart Krijger may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anna Jerman Bonito and Esteni Rodriguez Estopinan de Witlicki may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provision of section (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ivan Gerasko may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jose Alvarez, Hildegard Kropfitsch Pelloski, George Roland Lavoie, Katharine Lajimodiere (nee Schneeberger), Luigi Cardone, Ingeburg Edith Stallings (nee Nitzki), and Hilde Schiller may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to enactment of this act.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on June 30, 1955, the Senate passed Senate bill 315 to waive the grounds of inadmissibility in behalf of the beneficiary. On February 7, 1956, the House of Representatives passed the

bill with amendments to include the beneficiaries of 11 similar individual Senate bills. One case included in the bill passed the Senate, to grant permanent residence, but has been amended to grant a waiver of the excludable grounds.

The amendments are acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate bill 315.

The motion was agreed to.

THERESA POK LIM KIM

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 396) for the relief of Theresa Pok Lim Kim, which were, on page 1, line 6, after "visitor", insert "and may be admitted to the United States"; on page 2, after line 12, insert:

SEC. 2. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Edith Kalwies, the fiance of William H. Crandall, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor and may be admitted to the United States for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Edith Kalwies is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said William H. Crandall and that she is found to be otherwise admissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act other than the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of that act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided further*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Edith Kalwies, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Edith Kalwies, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Edith Kalwies as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Concetta Speranza Tapp, widow of Floyd William Tapp, shall, if otherwise found admissible to the United States, be deemed to be a nonquota immigrant.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Rosa Roppo, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Michael Roppo and Julia Roppo, citizens of the United States.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on June 14, 1955, the Senate passed Senate bill 396, to provide for the admission of the beneficiary to the United States for the purpose of marrying her United States citizen fiance. On February 21, 1956, the House of Representatives passed the bill, with amendments to include the beneficiaries of three individual Senate bills.

Inasmuch as the amendments make no substantive changes, but merely group several cases into one bill, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate bill 396.

The motion was agreed to.

WILLIAM T. COLLINS (VASILIOS T. BUZUNIS)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 663) for the relief of William T. Collins (Vasilios T. Buzunis), which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, William T. Collins, also known as Vasilios Buzunis, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on July 11, 1955, the Senate passed Senate bill 663, to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to the beneficiary. On March 6, 1956, the House of Representatives passed the bill, with an amendment to grant a waiver of the grounds of inadmissibility in behalf of the beneficiary. By departing from the United States, the beneficiary will be able to qualify for a visa to reenter the United States for permanent residence.

This language is acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

MR. AND MRS. ANDREJ (AVRAM) GOTTLIEB

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 963) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Andrej (Avram) Gottlieb, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Andrej (Avram) Gottlieb, Jenny Gottlieb (nee Binder), Toy Lin Chen, Nouritza Terzian, Maria Ioannou Karvelis, Martha Karvelis, Boeleta Karvelis, and Euterpi Karvelis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of certain aliens."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on July 22, 1955, the Senate passed S. 963, to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to the beneficiaries. On March 20, 1956, the House of Representatives passed Senate bill 963 with amendments to include the beneficiaries of three similar individual Senate bills.

Inasmuch as the House amendments make no substantive changes but merely group several cases into one bill, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

PURITA RODRIGUEZ ADIARTE AND HER TWO MINOR CHILDREN

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1242) for the relief of Purita Rodriguez Adiarte and her two minor children, Irene Grace Adiarte and Patrick Robert Adiarte, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Purita Rodriquez Adiarte, Irene Grace Adiarte, Patrick Robert Adiarte, Katharina Steinbach, Joseph G. Ferrara, Clorinda Perri Sturino, Yee Loy Foo (also known as Loy Foo Yee or Ted Yee), Kosmas Vassilios Fournarakis, Rosita A. Jocson, Young Hi Yun, Cheuk Wa Leung, Camilla Ying Ling Leung, Panagiotis Nicolas Lalos, Antyro Panagiotis Lalos, Myra Louise Dew, and George Poulio shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Haim Cohen (Haim Braun) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence upon payment of the required visa fee.

SEC. 3. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bonds, which may have been issued in the case of Antonio Domenico Narciso Bianchi. From and after the date of the enactment of this act, the said Antonio Domenico Narciso Bianchi shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of certain aliens."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on July 11, 1955, the Senate passed Senate bill 1242, which would grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to the beneficiary. On March 6, 1956, the House of Representatives passed the bill, with amendments to include the beneficiaries of 12 individual Senate bills. One case included in the bill passed the Senate, to grant permanent residence to the beneficiary, but has been amended to provide only for cancellation of outstanding deportation proceedings in behalf of the

beneficiary, and will accomplish the desired effect in providing relief from deportation.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

UNIQUE PLACE OF JAMES F. BYRNES IN AMERICAN HISTORY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for approximately 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from South Carolina may proceed.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on January 9 of this year, the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas placed in the RECORD the names of 109 persons who have served their States as governor, Member of the United States House of Representatives, and Member of the United States Senate. Since that time I have had the records checked and find that one of the distinguished gentlemen named holds a unique place in history. In addition to having served his State as governor, as United States Representative, and as United States Senator, the Honorable James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, has also served on the United States Supreme Court and as a member of the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

He is the only person in history who has held the three high offices mentioned by the Senator from Kansas and who, in addition, has served on the Court and in the Cabinet.

I would like to take this occasion, as the date of his next birthday approaches, to mention some of the highlights in the career of this son of South Carolina who attained the stature of world statesman.

James Francis Byrnes is of Irish descent, his grandparents having immigrated from the old country. His father, who was a clerk in the city government at Charleston, S. C., died a few months before his son was born on May 2, 1879.

At the age of 14, James F. Byrnes left school to help earn a living for himself and his mother. He worked in a law office in Charleston. He learned shorthand and by the time he was 20, he was making enough money as a stenographer to support his mother.

Young Byrnes entered a competition for the position of court reporter and won the job. He moved to Aiken, S. C., and, while working in the court, he studied law and was admitted to the bar in 1903. For a time, he also owned and edited a weekly newspaper in Aiken.

Mr. Byrnes married Miss Maude Perkins Busch, of Aiken, on May 2, 1906. She is a charming lady who has been a true helpmate to her distinguished husband.

Mr. Byrnes won his first election by 57 votes in 1908 when he was elected solicitor of the second circuit of South Carolina. After 2 years, he was elected to Congress from South Carolina's second district, and served in the House of Representatives for 14 years.

During World War I, he was 1 of 5 members of the House Deficiency Appropriations Committee which was responsible for recommending most of the appropriations made by the Congress for war activities.

One of the first things he did as a Congressman was to bring about the formation of the House Committee on Roads, from which grew the present Federal roads system.

In 1924 Mr. Byrnes lost the only political contest of the many in which he has participated. He ran for the Senate but lost to Cole L. Blease by a narrow margin.

For the next 6 years, Mr. Byrnes practiced law in Spartanburg, S. C., in the firm of Nichols, Wyche and Byrnes. Mr. Nichols had himself served in Congress and Mr. C. C. Wyche, the other member of the firm, has been for many years a distinguished Federal district judge in the western district of South Carolina.

In 1930 Mr. Byrnes ran against Senator Blease and defeated him. Senator Byrnes was a powerful and respected member of this body for the next 11 years. He rarely made a speech on the floor, but he seldom missed a committee meeting. When he did make a speech, his words were carefully weighed in high quarters. His power of persuasion in committees and in the cloakroom was legendary even while he was in the Senate.

At the Democratic Convention in 1932, Senator Byrnes had an important part in the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt as the presidential candidate. In the Senate he was chief lieutenant for the President. When he did not agree with Roosevelt proposals, he did not hesitate to vote against them.

In July 1941, President Roosevelt appointed Senator Byrnes to the Supreme Court, the third person from South Carolina ever to serve on the Court and the first in nearly a century and a half.

At the ceremony when Associate Justice Byrnes took the oath of office, President Roosevelt said he wished he were Solomon so he could divide Byrnes in two, appointing half of him to the Supreme Court and leaving the other half in the Senate.

But America was soon at war and Justice Byrnes offered himself to President Roosevelt for whatever service he could render his country.

In October 1942, the President called him from the Court to head the Office of Economic Stabilization and to coordinate the war effort.

His responsibilities were increased in 1943 when he was made Director of War Mobilization. In November 1944, the additional responsibilities of reconversion were put under his direction and his title became Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion. Except for the President, no other official in Government held so much power and responsibility. He was known as and in fact was the assistant President.

For his meritorious service in these vital offices during World War II, the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended that Justice Byrnes be awarded the Distinguished Service Medal. The President made the award on August 4, 1945, and read the following citation:

> Mr. James F. Byrnes, as Director of War Mobilization from October 1942 to March 1945, discharged duties of great responsibility with outstanding success. Faced with the problem of aiding the Chief Executive in girding the Nation for a conflict of unprecedented proportion, he accomplished his task with exceptional skill. * * * He accompanied the Commander in Chief to vital conferences, applying his extensive knowledge of interallied problems to their prompt and effective solution. With vast understanding, exceptional ability as an arbiter, unswerving devotion to the national interests and firm determination, Mr. Byrnes performed difficult service (of high importance), making a major contribution to the war effort.

President Truman called him out of retirement to become Secretary of State. He held the office for 562 days and 350 of those days were spent at international conferences. His journeys abroad carried him to London, Paris, Potsdam, and Moscow. As a diplomat he traveled approximately 77,000 miles. Other important conferences, including the 1946 meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers, were held in this country.

Secretary Byrnes established the United States policy of firmness and patience with Russia in the early postwar period. He gave Germany hope for the future and helped to bind our relations with that country.

The statement of American policy which then helped bind Germany to the West was made by Secretary Byrnes in a speech at Stuttgart on September 6, 1946. He told the German people that the United States would continue her interest in the affairs of Europe and of the world. In words that Russia could not misunderstand, he declared that "peace and well-being cannot be purchased at the price of the peace and well-being of any other country." He assured the Germans that American troops would remain in their land as long as the troops of any other nation remained.

Another principal achievement by Mr. Byrnes as Secretary of State was the negotiation of the Balkan treaties.

Time magazine named Secretary Byrnes "man of the year" for 1946. In its cover article in the issue of January 6, 1947, Time said:

> Had 1946 ended as it began, Molotov would have been the year's man. * * *
>
> Before the year was out, however, the Russian flood was contained. On the dam that held it many men had labored. * * * But the dam's chief builder was James F. Byrnes * * * who became the firm and patient voice of the United States in the councils of the world. * * *
>
> He managed to get over to the Russians, and the world, that the United States had planted the weight of its power in the path of the Russian advance.

Mr. Byrnes' resignation as Secretary of State was effective on January 20, 1947. He again took up active legal practice in the appellate courts, commuting between an office in Washington and one in South Carolina.

Persuaded that he could render vital service to South Carolina as Governor, he entered the Democratic primary in

1950 and won nomination over three opponents.

Governor Byrnes had campaigned on two main planks: That he would do everything in his power to improve the public schools of the State and that he would seek extensive improvements of facilities for mental patients.

He was inaugurated Governor in January 1951, and by the end of the legislative session that spring, Governor Byrnes had succeeded in getting the legislature to enact a broad program of educational improvement. A statewide school construction program resulted in allocation by the State of $125 million for new schools. This program has now reached the $200 million mark.

In his inaugural address, Governor Byrnes called for the unmasking of the Ku Klux Klan. This law was quickly enacted by the general assembly.

Many other progressive programs were started and completed during the Byrnes administration in South Carolina.

In 1952 Governor Byrnes declared his support for General Eisenhower in the presidential race. He stated that he did so because he felt he must place principle above party and that he believed the general the best qualified candidate for the office.

In 1953 Governor Byrnes served as a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations General Assembly.

Several years ago at the unveiling of a portrait of Mr. Byrnes in the South Carolina Senate, his friend Bernard Baruch spoke. He described Mr. Byrnes as "having joined that little band of immortals who make the world a finer and more peaceful place. We, of South Carolina, will always glory in that name."

Since he attained fame, Governor Byrnes has been the recipient of a number of honorary degrees from some of America's great universities. Occasionally, he comments humorously that he has been educated by degrees.

In 1947 he wrote a book, Speaking Frankly, which is an account of his experiences as Secretary of State. He established the James F. Byrnes Foundation to administer the proceeds from the sale of the book, and nearly 150 needy orphan students have received grants to prepare them for their chosen careers. The man who walked with kings did not forget those who needed help when he was able to offer that help.

Upon retirement from public office in 1955, Governor and Mrs. Byrnes built a new home in Columbia, the capital of South Carolina. He no longer practices law, but he goes to his private office almost daily to answer mail which comes from friends and strangers in faraway places.

He has the esteem, the high prestige, and the great respect and affection of millions, not only in South Carolina but throughout the world.

His career has been unique; his position of prominence is equally unique.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there further morning business? If not, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 898) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, to regulate the use of motor vehicles not owned by motor carriers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Florida be recognized at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the trip-leasing issue has been before the Congress for over 3 years and I believe the time is way overdue that it be settled by statute to remove the continuing doubt, uncertainty, and confusion it has brought to those engaged in transporting agricultural commodities by motor vehicle. Likewise, the uncertainty and confusion should be ended in fairness to the farmers of the Nation who produce crops which, in order to be put to beneficial use, must be transported to the persons and places where they are needed.

Let me make perfectly clear at the outset that the bill before the Senate today, S. 898, as reported by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on July 30, 1955, in the closing days of the first session of this Congress, is a compromise bill. It is far different from the bill overwhelmingly passed by the House in 1953 (H. R. 3203) and as introduced in the Senate during the last session.

In its reported form it has been cut down from completely prohibiting the ICC to regulate length of lease or amount of compensation for a lease to meet the minimum necessary needs of agriculture, and contains far less restriction on the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the leasing of trucks than the earlier regulation.

First, let me give a little history and background to the problem. There are two general types of motor carriers which are fully regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission—common motor carriers which must obtain certificates of convenience and necessity and contract carriers which must obtain permits for operating authority. These two general types of carriers are generally referred to as authorized carriers.

Outside of the regulatory control and authority of the ICC, except as to safety matters, are four main groups of carriers most concerned in this legislation, namely farmers, cooperative associations of farmers, operators who haul agricultural commodities, and private carriers.

Back in May 1951, the Interstate Commerce Commission issued some regulations in a proceeding known as Ex Parte MC–43 to govern the lease and interchange of vehicles by motor carriers—Lease and Interchange of Vehicles by Motor Carriers, 52 MCC 675. One of the rules promulgated by the Commission would have limited the minimum duration of the lease of any truck to an authorized carrier to 30 days. This rule became the subject of court action and finally, on January 12, 1953, the Supreme Court of the United States held, in the case of *American Trucking Associations* v. *U. S.* (344 U. S. 298 (1953)), that although the Interstate Commerce Act contained no specific grant of authority from the Congress to the Commission to put such a restrictive rule into effect; however, under the implications of the general grants of authority in the Interstate Commerce Act, the promulgation of this rule for authorized carriers falls within the Commission's power.

Just where did this decision of the Supreme Court in 1953 leave agriculture as to its ability to meet its practical transportation requirements?

Judging from the outcry and protestations that came from farmers and their representatives from nearly all sections of the country, continuing right down to today, it left the farmers away out on the limb and the limb was about to be cut off.

For many years, even predating the passage of the Motor Carrier Act of 1935, trucks hauling farm products to market have found it necessary to try to obtain from some of the regular carriers a load of general freight to transport back to or in the general direction of the area where the original movement started. This has helped to reduce the cost of transporting the farm products to markets because obviously the rate or cost on the initial movement is decreased if a payload can be obtained for the backhaul.

The imposition of the 30-day minimum limitation proposed by the Interstate Commerce Commission on the lease of trucks with drivers to authorized carriers, by farmers, cooperative associations of farmers, operators hauling agricultural commodities, or private carriers would obviously prohibit trip-leasing, which is usually for only a few days. None of these haulers would or could tie up their trucks to authorized carriers, even if the authorized carriers needed them, for a period of 30 days when their economic need was to return as fast as possible to home base or go to another harvest area to perform legitimate hauling functions.

So the people in agriculture, alert to the serious dislocations and the great blow that would be dealt the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities by the imposition of the 30-day rule of the ICC, asked Congress to establish a fair, clear policy by law which would preserve the economical and efficient practice of leasing trucks, with drivers, to authorized carriers for backhauls.

Bills were simultaneously introduced in the Senate and House in 1953. The House of Representatives moved first to consider the proposed legislation to relieve the plight of the farmer which would result from the prohibition by the ICC against trip-leasing. After extended public hearings before the House

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in 1953, and lengthy executive sessions, the House Commerce Committee reported favorably and the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed H. R. 3203 on a voice vote June 24, 1953.

The bill gave the Interstate Commerce Commission affirmative powers not theretofore written specifically in the Interstate Commerce Act to regulate leasing practices, but denied to the Commission the authority "to regulate the duration of any such lease, contract, or other arrangement for the use of any motor vehicle, or the amount of compensation to be paid for such use." The compensation provision was inserted in order to prevent the Commission through indirect control over the amount of the rental compensation for the lease of trucks to bring about the abolition of trip-leasing.

Let me make it clear here that when an agricultural hauler leases his truck and services to an authorized carrier for a backhaul, the agricultural hauler and authorized carrier may mutually agree upon any rental compensation they care to but the authorized carrier must charge the published tariff rate to the shipper, whose freight is being hauled, just as if he were using an owned, rather than a leased truck.

Although public hearings were held before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the trip-leasing bill in 1953, no action was taken. Again hearings were held in May and June 1954, before the full Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the trip-leasing bill. In spite of repeated efforts by some members of the committee on both sides of the aisle to bring the bill to a vote in the committee, these efforts were unsuccessful, and the 83d Congress was permitted to adjourn in 1954 without a committee vote being taken.

At the beginning of the 84th Congress, last year, the junior Senator from Oklahome [Mr. MONRONEY] and I cosponsored the trip-leasing bill again and public hearings were held on this legislation before our Subcommittee on Surface Transportation during June 1955.

Finally on July 30, 1955, in the closing days of the first session of this Congress, the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported the bill, with amendments, favorably to the Senate.

The committee report is before the Senate and sets forth a summary analysis of the problem and compelling reasons why the proposed legislation is sound and necessary. It has been clearly demonstrated on the record that if the Commission's original 30-day rule had gone into effect, it would have resulted in substantial increases in transportation charges for moving agricultural products from the farmer to the consumer. In addition, it would have put out of business many of the agricultural haulers upon whom many farmers, particularly the family-type farmers, are dependent for the marketing of their products.

The Commission has evidenced its recognition of this condition by amending its proposed 30-day rule at least 3 times while the proposed legislation was before Congress, and has also during the past 3-year period extended from time to time the effective date of the 30-day rule which is now scheduled for July 1, 1956. Except for the trip-leasing feature with respect to private carriers, the Commission has no objection to the bill.

Simply stating the problem before us, farmers and others have empty trucks which must be moved to points where traffic is available. Rather than incur the loss of moving an empty truck, the truck is leased for use to someone who has traffic to be moved in the direction in which the truck is bound. Usually the lease is for only a few days or for the duration of a trip; hence the term "trip lease." Such leases are often necessary to get the truck into position for profitable use, and are often arranged with common and contract carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act.

Under the July 1 order, the ICC would have leases of motor vehicles made for a minimum of 30 days, thus effectively putting an end to trip leasing and the economies accompanying it. S. 898 would establish standards for the ICC to follow in regard to trip leasing, with specific provisions designed to meet the needs of agriculture and private carriers.

I have spent a great deal of time on this matter and have conferred with representatives of farm operators from all sections of the country. I am convinced that the bill has been watered down as much as is possible without permitting serious detriment to the marketing of farm products. We all know there are actually thousands of private canneries, meat-packing houses, citrus plants, and the like, which, because of the continual increase in railroad and regulated motor-carrier rates, have been forced from the standpoint of economy of operations to buy their own trucks and transport their own products to their customers. These trucks are an important part of the transportation pool that serves the farmer's total transportation needs.

It would be uneconomic to permit a farmer or a group of farmers who have trucks in which they haul canned vegetables to their customers to lease the trucks to authorized carriers for a back haul, but to deny the same right to the privately owned cannery across the road from the farmer's plant. Likewise, the transportation costs and the right of the private cannery to trip lease have a direct bearing upon the amount which the private cannery can pay the farmer for his products. The same is true with respect to the thousands of private dairy plants, meat-packing houses, and other private concerns that deliver to their customers in their own trucks the processed food and fiber produced on the Nation's farms.

It is important to note that the private carrier, under the bill, cannot go all around the country, as it has been claimed some have done in the past, but will be definitely restricted in leasing his truck in a single movement or in one or more of a series of movements, loaded or empty, in the general direction of the general area in which such motor vehicle is based.

So much for the bill, what it will do, and why it is necessary. So far as agriculture is concerned, there is a more far-reaching reason why it is necessary for Congress to settle the matter of trip-leasing by statute rather than to leave it for determination by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Ever since the passage of the Motor Carrier Act in 1935, the ICC has demonstrated its attitude toward the exemption from route and rate regulation of trucks hauling agricultural commodities, which Congress wrote into the Motor Carrier Act in 1935. Obviously the advantage to farmers of exemption from rate regulation of trucks hauling farm products to markets is dependent upon those trucks being able to earn some compensation on the return movement which results in lower round-trip operational costs.

Time and time again the ICC since 1935 has recommended legislative action to Congress which would either restrict or completely repeal the agricultural exemption. In the 69th Annual Report of the ICC to Congress, dated November 1, 1955, and submitted just a few weeks ago, the Commission at page 128 recommended "that section 203 (b) be amended so as to limit the exemption of motor vehicles transporting agricultural commodities, fish, and livestock to transportation from point of production to primary market."

In the same report, at page 129, the Commission recommended that agricultural haulers and private carriers, as well as other carriers subject to safety regulations but not subject to economic regulation, be required to register with the Commission. Of course, we all know that registration is a customary first step toward eventual full economic regulation.

Aside from its legislative recommendations, the Commission time and again through strict construction of the scope of the term "agricultural commodities" has clearly demonstrated that it wants to exercise more and more regulatory power over the manner and cost of the movement of agricultural commodities by motor vehicle. Today there is pending before the Supreme Court a case to determine whether dressed poultry is an agricultural commodity. The Commission, although admitting that live poultry is an agricultural commodity and that trucks hauling it are beyond its regulatory jurisdiction, has contended that chickens with their heads and feathers removed have been transformed into a manufactured product and trucks hauling such dressed poultry are subject to the Commission's regulatory powers as to rates and routes. In the eighth Federal circuit, where it was held that dressed poultry is an agricultural product, the ICC follows this ruling. In the remainder of the country, the ICC considers dressed chickens a manufactured product—*Kroblin* v. *U. S.* (348 U. S. 836 (1954)).

Likewise, there is now being litigated in a New Jersey district court the issue of whether shelled nuts are an agricultural commodity. The Commission says no; agriculture thinks that whether shelled or in the shell, nuts are an agricultural commodity.

These are only a few of the many decisions by the Commission reflecting its attitude toward the agricultural commodities exemption, an attitude which has caused farmers to feel extremely insecure about the trip-leasing problem; they will continue to so feel until Congress acts. I must say, in all fairness, that there is much other evidence in the record to support agriculture's concern and feeling of insecurity.

Furthermore, the ICC is an agency of mortal men who may be on the Commission today and gone tomorrow. Any decision by the Commission today on this 30-day leasing rule which will protect the proper interests of agriculture might not be the decision of the Commission tomorrow or at some time in the future when the composition of the Commission has changed. This, of course, does not impute any bad faith at all to either former, present or future members of the Commission. As an example of the changes that occur, since the end of 1955, a little over 2 months, there have developed 4 vacancies on the Commission. Since May 1951, when the original 30-day rule was issued by the Commission, 10 of its 11 members have departed by resignation, retirement, or expiration of their terms.

There are other compelling reasons arising from the manner in which this whole problem has been handled by the Commission that makes, I believe, action by the Congress necessary.

On February 2, 1955, the ICC by official order postponed the effective date of the controversial 30-day rule from March 1, 1955, to March 1, 1956. The deferment was stated as being primarily for the purpose of affording Congress an adequate opportunity to consider and dispose of the pending legislation. On June 22, 1955, when spokesmen for the ICC appeared before our subcommittee at public hearings on this bill, in discussing the effective date of the 30-day rule, the Commission spokesman reiterated that the effective date of the rule had been postponed until March 1, 1956. These assurances were one factor in our willingness for this bill to go over from last year to this second session for action by the Senate. Then out of the clear, after Congress had adjourned last year, on October 17, 1955, the ICC made public an order advancing from March 1, 1956, to December 1, 1955, the effective date of the controversial 30-day rule.

Many Members of the Congress are familiar with this event, and only after many protests from Members of Congress and shippers around the country did the Commission, on November 15, 1955, restore the effective date to March 1, 1956. The Commission subsequently deferred the effective date to July 1, 1956.

I bring this matter to the attention of the Senate, not in any spirit of destructive criticism of the Commission, for whom as individuals and an official body I have the highest respect. I do regard it as essential, however, that the Members of the Senate be acquainted with some of the facts incident to the ICC's handling of this whole matter, which certainly is not conducive to the inspiration of confidence on the part of the agricultural shippers of the Nation that their interests will be reasonably protected in this matter unless a policy is established by statute.

In conclusion, I wish to say a few words on this matter of safety. Some of the opponents of the bill have made the argument that trip-leasing must be prohibited to promote safety on our highways. Of course, safety is a matter that is close to the hearts of every American. It involves the welfare of all our families and every person using our highways. We are in accord with every reasonable move that will promote safety. But the fact is that, in the hundreds of pages of printed testimony before congressional committees on this issue, I cannot find any convincing evidence, if any evidence at all, that the leased trucks on our highways are more dangerous than owned trucks. Realistically, it is reasonable to believe that the man who owns and drives a truck under lease to someone else, in which he has an investment, would be just as careful, if not more so than the man who is an employee driver.

A few dramatic cases have been brought up which show accidents in which leased trucks have been involved. But they do not prove anything. One could as reasonably argue that the several railroad accidents in recent months, in which a considerable number of persons have been killed and many more injured, make rail transportation more hazardous than some other modes of transportation. But such argument would be absurd.

There are two rather convincing points that undermine the weight of the safety argument that has been advanced against this bill.

First, the Supreme Court dispelled this argument in its decision on January 12, 1953, involving this issue. The majority opinion said:

> The conclusion that highway safety may be impaired rests admittedly on informed speculation rather than statistical certainty. A road check examination conducted by the Bureau (Bureau of Motor Carriers, ICC) did not indicate any significant difference in the number of safety violations between leased and owned vehicles (*American Trucking Associations* v. *U. S.* (344 U. S. 298, 305, footnote 7 (1953)).

Second, after the controversy over the 30-day rule developed, the ICC reopened the leasing proceeding to take additional testimony on the issue. Further hearings were held before an ICC examiner in 1954 at which many witnesses appeared. The examiner's proposed report was finally released on January 17, 1955, based upon all the evidence he had received, and in his official report on the matter of safety he gave substantially the same answer regarding safety as was given by the Supreme Court.

Thereupon the examiner recommended to the Commission that the effective date of the 30-day rule be postponed until at least March 1, 1957, and that the Commission enter an order requiring authorized carriers to segregate all reportable accidents reported according to whether the accident involves company-owned, term-leased, or trip-leased equipment. The examiner's recommendation contemplated that in the 2-year period reliable data on a natonwide basis could be compiled and considered at a further hearing as to just what bearing, if any, the trip-leasing of vehicles had on the matter of safety on the highways.

But the Commission did not see fit to follow this recommendation of their examiner, who had heard all the evidence and had an opportunity to weigh it carefully. Instead, the Commission proceeded to order the 30-day rule to go into effect, although it has been subsequently postponed.

So, regardless of the arguments made against this bill in the name of safety, which is of universal concern to us all, it is perfectly clear from the record that such arguments are based on isolated cases and conjecture—not facts that prove anything.

I do not think I need to say more at this time. There was probably never a bill which came before the Senate on which there have been more thorough hearings and screening and on which so much effort has been expended to reconcile the opposing views.

In view of the extended debate recently held on this floor on the farm bill, in an effort to find a constructive way to help the farmer help himself, it is inconceivable to me that the Congress would permit an agency of Government to be free to further extend its regulatory powers, as the ICC has proposed to do and as this bill is intended to prevent, with a certain further increase in transportation costs and a further tightening of the cost-price squeeze on the farmers of our Nation.

This is one of the few issues in my memory on which all of the farm organizations and agriculture generally, from the grassroots to Washington, have been in accord. The National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the National Farmers Union, as well as scores of other national organizations across the country serving farmers in their marketing operations, have publicly and privately, time and again, urged the passage of this legislation.

I highly recommend that the Senate pass S. 898.

I might say at this point that, as the able chairman of the committee knows, and as the former chairman of the committee is aware, we have discussed this particular proposed legislation, not only with the farm groups, but we have talked it over with the railroad associations, with the trucking groups, and with the representatives of the private carriers.

The bill which is now before the Senate represents the very best bill we shall be able to get on this particular problem. It is my hope that we shall be able to pass a bill which will, once and for all, define exactly what we mean when we give an agricultural exemption and at the same time try to recognize, as we do in the bill, that if we are to have any sort of regulated common carriage in this country, we must continue to give to the ICC certain authority whereby it can control certain certificated common carriers.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the Senator from Florida advise me whether the bill as it has been reported will cover the problem adequately?

Mr. SMATHERS. My answer is "yes." I think the bill will protect the different groups. I am sure it protects the reasonable demands of the agricultural groups.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I understand an amendment later will be offered. My interest in the bill and the amendment which will be presented results from the fact that in my State of New Jersey there are several large firms which are engaged in the processing of quick-frozen foods, especially the Seabrook Farms—and several firms dealing in canned foods, especially the Campbell soup firm. I understand the bill is to be amended in a way which might affect the activities of the frozen-food industry and the canned-soup industry in my State.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if I may interrupt, I think if the Senator from New Jersey will wait until I offer the amendment, it might be a better time to ask the question.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be glad to postpone further questioning of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from New Mexico so that he may submit a conference report, without my losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of March 27, 1956, pp. 5765–5768, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ANDERSON Mr. President, I have prepared a statement which I wished to present and have printed in the RECORD for the purpose of adding to the legislative history. I do not intend to read the statement at this time. Other members of the committee are present. I am anxious to have them comment on the conference report.

But I ask unanimous consent to have my statement on the conference report printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ANDERSON ON CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 500, TO AUTHORIZE THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

In connection with the conference report on S. 500, to authorize the Colorado River Storage Project, a few comments on the consummation of this legislative objective are desirable, not only as a matter of information to the Congress, but to make a matter of record certain points in connection with the legislative history of this measure for the guidance of the executive departments in considering administrative features of the bill. The legislative history will also have an important bearing as a matter of guidance for the Congress in the future in connection with appropriations for the construction of the Colorado River Storage Project.

First, I desire, on behalf of the Senate conferees, to express our appreciation of the cooperative spirit shown by the House conferees in connection with the deliberations of this all-important measure, not only to the development of the upper Colorado River Basin States, but to the arid West and the country as a whole. The adoption of the Conference report will again put the Congress on record in registering unmistakable approval of the reclamation program, initiated under the leadership of Theodore Roosevelt, through the enactment of the Reclamation Act of 1902. The stamp of approval the Congress registers through adopting the conference report will serve as a rebuke to detractors of the Reclamation program as an instrument for the conservation of the water resources of the West for irrigation, hydroelectric power production, municipal, industrial and domestic water supply. It is the unmistakable answer of the Congress to proposals that the potential water resources of the West—in this case the Colorado River Basin—shall be limited to aid one particular area of the West and that another vital segment of the West shall be condemned to remain undeveloped.

Likewise, its recognition of the fact that again the Reclamation program is recognized by the Congress, the President and the executive departments as deserving and receiving nonpolitical, nonpartisan and nonsectional support.

I refer to the fact that the program for the Colorado River storage project was developed under the democratic administrations of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, and it was endorsed and recommended by a Republican, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

On the passage of the bill in the Senate, by a vote of 58 to 23, more than 2 to 1, the party division was:

For the bill: Democrats, 31; Republicans, 27.

Against the bill: Democrats, 15; Republicans, 8.

Not voting: Democrats, 3; Republicans, 12.

In the House of Representatives the vote was:

For the bill: Democrats, 63; Republicans, 120.

Against the bill: Democrats, 63; Republicans, 73.

Absent or not voting: Democrats, 32; Republicans, 8.

Passed, 1.

Paired for: Democrats, 11; Republicans, 1.

Paired against: Democrats, 9; Republicans, 3.

This party division is cited for the purpose of showing the nonpartisan front that maintains confidence that the Congress, when the chips are down, drops political considerations and votes for developments of natural resources that benefit the entire country.

Now, as to some of the features of the Colorado River storage bill itself, I point out a few essential provisions for the legislative record for administrative guidance in connection with the programing, construction, and operation of the Colorado River project.

I shall not reiterate all of the items commented on by the managers on the part of the House in their report. However, I do desire to point out several features of the bill as presented by the conference report which have significance with respect to the legislative history of the measure.

First, Senate bill 500 reaffirms the law of the river, as applied to the Colorado River system by the Colorado River compact of 1922, the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of 1939, and the upper Colorado River compact of 1950. The language with respect to the law of the river is designed to protect the legitimate interest of all States, whether in the lower or the upper basin, in their rights to Colorado River water as laid down in the compacts and in congressional legislation enacted in pursuance thereof.

An objective of the reiteration of the law of the river is also to give maximum protection to lawful contracts made in pursuance of the compacts and the existing legislation. An objective is to minimize the justification for controversy or legal action over contracts or agreements that do not flow directly from congressional authorizations or action.

A second major point that requires elaboration as to the intent of the Congress is with respect to section 12 which reads as follows:

"There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this act, but not to exceed $760 million."

It should be pointed out that the amount of $760 million written into the bill by the House committee and approved on the floor of that body represents merely a current limitation on appropriations authorized and not a limitation on the estimated cost of the features of the project directly authorized in the bill or conditionally authorized through the requirement of the feasibility report by the Secretary before construction may begin, as in the case of the Curecanti Dam in Colorado or projects which may hereafter be authorized by the Congress.

In this connection, the record is made for the information of the Senate and as a part of the legislative history. The conferees considered precedents which have been established by the executive agencies and the Congress with respect to language and figures similar to those in section 12, to which I have referred. Two outstanding examples of precedents may be cited.

One is in connection with the Boulder Canyon project, Nevada-Arizona, in the lower Colorado River Basin. When this project, of which the present Hoover Dam is the principal unit, was authorized by the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928, an appropriation of $165 million was authorized. Without any change in the language in the original act, the Congress, on presentation of the situation to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, has appropriated a total of $223,064,101. Appropriations for Hoover Dam and powerplant alone have totaled $160 million, or within $5 million of the appropriations authorized in the original act of 1928. The excess over the original authorization has gone into construction of the All-American and Coachella Canals.

A more recent and at least an applicable precedent is cited in the case of appropriations authorized for construction of the Missouri River Basin project. In this case, the Congress has authorized total appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, of $550 million, in amounts of approximately $150 million at a time. Actual appropriations made under these authorizations now total $494 million.

At the same time, construction of units under the Missouri River Basin project, in-

cluding multiple-purpose dams, powerplants, and irrigation works have been completed, or started, that entail an ultimate cost of approximately $845 million. This procedure has been explained to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House by the Bureau of Reclamation with approval of the Department of the Interior. In our opinion, the Missouri Basin project record constitutes an adequate precedent that will insure the ability of the Secretary of the Interior to finance from appropriations to be made by the Congress the initial construction of all of the storage dams and projects authorized or conditionally authorized (such as Curecanti Dam) in S. 500. In simple words, this explanation means that the Secretary of the Interior can and should proceed as rapidly as initial funds are appropriated by the Congress with the construction of the storage dams such as Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge and Navaho, those in the initial phase of the central Utah project and Curecanti Dam, when the Secretary of the Interior reports to the Congress that the benefits anticipated from the Curecanti Dam exceed the estimated cost.

At the same time, the program for and initial construction of the authorized participating irrigation projects should proceed. Of course, water must be available; local interest in repayment manifest; and the limitations with respect to bringing new land into production under the surplus crop limitation amendment met.

The Senate conferees accepted the delineation from the bill by the House of the controversial Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument area of western Colorado. The position of the Senate has been that Echo Park Dam would benefit rather than adversely affect the national monument area, and constituted no invasion of the sanctity of national parks. However, out of deference to the sincere views of the great majority of the conservation organizations of the country, and so as to expedite authorization of the upper Colorado River storage project, the Senate conferees yielded on the Echo Park point and made no effort to urge the House conferees to accept the Senate version in this respect. We regard that matter as closed.

Provision is made in the bill for the protection of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument by directing that the Secretary of the Interior in connection with the construction of the Glen Canyon unit, shall take adequate measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge and National Monument.

The conferees, by appropriate language, adhere to the traditional position of the Congress with respect to construction costs of irrigation facilities on Indian lands. Those Indian lands, under participating irrigation projects authorized by the bill, will not be subject to irrigation construction charges as long as they remain in Indian ownership.

With respect to the Navaho participating project in New Mexico the following sentence in section 6 of the bill as submitted by the conferees reads as follows:

"In the event that the Navaho participating project is authorized, the costs allocated to irrigation of Indian-owned tribal or restricted lands within, under, or served by such project, and beyond the capability of such lands to repay, shall be determined, and, in recognition of the fact that assistance to the Navaho Indians is the responsibility of the entire Nation, such costs shall be nonreimbursable."

The Senate conferees insisted, and the House conferees receded from the amendment to extend the repayment period for power and other facilities to 100 years. The language of the bill as shown in the conference report provides for a 50-year basic repayment period. It was our feeling that the 50-year period represents a sounder approach to the maintenance of the principles of the reclamation program.

In conclusion, the conferees express the hope that the construction program for the upper Colorado storage project shall be carried forward expeditiously, efficiently, and economically. Such suggested procedure will require adequate finances first to get planning of major storage units completed so that early contracts may be awarded for actual construction. Construction should be so programed and financed that long-drawn-out periods will be avoided. It is axiomatic that unduly lengthy construction periods result in excessive overhead costs and unexplainable delays in achieving the ultimate objective of the construction of the facilities.

The cooperation of the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and both Houses of the Congress in appropriating funds must be mobilized to effect the desired result.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I rise merely to express my deep appreciation of the great ability with which the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] handled this matter both before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and in the conference between the two Houses. The Senator from New Mexico has won the gratitude of all the upper basin States by the magnificient manner in which he led the fight for the attainment of this great objective, a work which will be of inestimable value to the upper basin States.

I see the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] upon the floor. He, too, like all the other members of the committee, labored unflaggingly to bring this legislation about. It harnesses the waters of the upper Colorado River, and for the first time stops the wastage of this vital force into the sea. Now, for the first time, in the upper basin States it can be put to use.

I know all of us feel most grateful to the Senator from New Mexico for what he has done.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I had not anticipated what the Senator from Wyoming would say.

I desire to pay tribute to the members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs who have participated in this rather long and arduous task, and particularly to pay tribute to the members of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation for their extremely fine work and cooperation. I am looking at the able senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who on behalf of all of us, introduced this bill or a similar bill 2 years ago, and who has steadfastly, consistently, and persistently assisted those of us who wanted to bring about the result to which the Senator from Wyoming has alluded.

I have been cheered by the fine spirit of cooperation which has been evidenced on both sides of the aisle; and in that connection I mention the work the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has done, and I also mention the work done by his senior colleague from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], and the excellent work done by the able and very conscientious Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. Let me say that I am particularly happy that the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is now on the floor. It would have been his privilege, as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to have caused us innumerable delays. But he did not do so. He fought vigorously and valiantly for the rights of his State; sometimes I thought he did so almost a little too vigorously. But he was not obstructive. He was willing to see that the Congress worked its way on this particular measure.

Mr. President, I am very anxious that there appear in the RECORD recognition of the fine work done by the members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and particularly by the members of its Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in his expression of appreciation of the way the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] handled the bill in committee and on the floor of the Senate, and in conference. His work was really outstanding.

It was very heartening to me to work with the group from both sides of the aisle and also with the House group on such a cooperative enterprise, so as really to bring forth a very fine bill which will accomplish the purposes desired to be accomplished by such very important legislation.

I also express my appreciation to the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], to the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], to my colleague from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and also to the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]—in short, to all the sponsors of Senate bill 500, which finally has reached this stage of parliamentary procedure. The cooperative effort which was made was very fine, indeed.

Naturally, at this time I think of the beginning of this work. It began many years ago, when the great project known as Hoover Dam was initiated. At that time we began an investigation of the upper Colorado resources and the possibilities of storing its water and putting it to beneficial use. That program has gone forward consistently since that time. When I came into the Congress, during the early stages of my service, I introduced at least two bills to authorize the central Utah project, which is part and parcel of this upper Colorado storage project.

Then in 1952, I believe, I introduced a bill to authorize the Colorado River project. I had been working in reclamation matters for many years before I came to the Senate; such matters have long been of special interest to me.

One of the great experiences in my life has been the outstanding cooperation and the fine spirit of nonpartisanship that have been manifested by all Members of both the House and the Senate who come from the upper basin States. I wish to extend my thanks to all Members of the Senate and to all others who have helped with this great piece of legislation.

I join with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] in his statement in respect to the junior Senator from

California [Mr. KUCHEL]. The Senator from California fought vigorously and valiantly to protect the rights of his State.

I am happy to say that, so far as I can determine, the bill—which I think I understand—protects the rights of California and of all the other States. The bill was not intended to take from any State anything which rightfully belonged to it, but was intended only to bring about the development of the waters which had been agreed upon by means of the compact, entered into in 1922, dealing with the waters belonging to the upper basin States, and the putting of them to beneficial use.

Mr. President, this measure is another forward step in accomplishing that great purpose. However, there is no use in our deceiving ourselves; we are still a long way from the time when the first dam will be completed and the water will be stored. It will take a long time to develop this project to its ultimate goal, namely, putting to beneficial use all the waters of the upper Colorado River which have been allotted to the four States under the 1922 compact.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this long dispute is about to be concluded. Senate bill 500 is about to receive final congressional approval and be sent to the President who will, I have no doubt, sign it into law.

Ever since I first came to the Senate, 4 years ago, I have fought as earnestly and as vigorously as I could against what I contended was proposed legislation inimical to the interests of the people of California whom I have the honor to represent in part.

I am more grateful than I can say to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] for their comment, because in all the zeal which has motivated me in opposing the measure which now is before us. Mr. President, I have endeavored to be free from rancor and bitterness. I shall never seek the role of demagogue. On the other hand one who serves in the Senate of the United States is not worth his salt unless as best he can he seeks to uphold the interests and rights and needs of the people he represents.

Mr. President, there are 1 or 2 questions which I should like to ask; and then I shall make a very brief comment, and shall conclude by congratulating my friends who are now finally victorious in this long controversy.

Referring to the conference report, and particularly to section 14, on page 6, I read:

SEC. 14. In the operation and maintenance of all facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin.

This is the language to which I desire particularly to refer:

In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits, as a defendant or otherwise.

I ask my friend from New Mexico what is the intention, in his opinion, of the language permitting a State to file such a suit against the United States?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the statement was repeatedly made that something in this legislation might permit an administration of the river which would do violence to the rights of California, Arizona, Nevada, or some other State. We tried by this language to make it entirely clear that if a State felt itself wronged by anything that was being done in the administration of the act, it could move immediately into the Supreme Court of the United States, the United States would automatically become a party, and it could proceed with the litigation of the existing trouble. We felt that that would permit a State also to represent its subdivisions, if they were in difficulty over the application of the law.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend from New Mexico. I remember very well the original discussion in the Senate committee with respect to rights to sue under this legislation, were there to arise a contention of grievance or a breach by a party to a contract with the Federal Government respecting water in the Colorado River. It is one of my pleasant memories that the Senate committee approved the amendment which I offered at that time, providing for the right to sue by States against the Federal Government. While the language, as it comes brack from the conference committee, is different from that which was originally approved, I am most happy to see that feature in the bill. I think it is a protection not alone to California, but to the other States of the Union. I am glad to have the views of the Senator from New Mexico, with whom I agree, that a State may, under the conference report, represent its subdivisions, and file a lawsuit if it feels aggrieved.

Mr. President, I would vigorously oppose any legislation which would permit political subdivisions to sue the Government of the United States. In my opinion that would be wrong, and I would oppose it. I am glad that such a provision is not a part of the conference report. But by the same token, I thank my friend from New Mexico and the other members of the conference committee who maintained and wrote into the conference report the right of a State to sue on its own behalf or on behalf of a subdivision, if the State should determine that there was a grievance under any water contract with the United States.

I wish to refer to two sections of the conference report, and to tell the members of the conference committee that I thank them for including them in the bill.

I refer first to certain language at the end of section 4, on page 3 of the conference report, which reads as follows:

All units and participating projects shall be subject to the apportionments of the use of water between the upper and lower basins of the Colorado River and among the States of the upper basin fixed in the Colorado River compact and the upper Colorado River Basin compact, respectively, and to the terms of the treaty with the United Mexican States (treaty series 994).

I read section 7, on page 5 of the conference report:

SEC. 7. The hydroelectric powerplants and transmission lines authorized by this act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but in the exercise of the authority hereby granted he shall not affect or interfere with the operation of the provisions of the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act and any contract lawfully entered into under said compacts and acts. Subject to the provisions of the Colorado River compact, neither the impounding nor the use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Colorado River storage project shall preclude or impair the appropriation of water for domestic or agricultural purposes pursuant to applicable State law.

I thank the conferees for including that language, as well as for including section 9. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the text of section 9, found on page 6 of the conference report.

There being no objection, the section was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Rio Grande compact of 1938, or the treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, California is a reclamation State. The State from which I come now has a popuation in excess of 13 million, and we receive into our State a thousand new permanent residents every day in the year. I am sure that they, and we who endeavor to serve them in the Congress, can look forward in the future to the sympathetic consideration of my fellow Senators with respect to their problems relating to water. Water is the basic problem before the people of California.

As I conclude, I congratulate my brethren from the upper Colorado River Basin States, and wish for them godspeed and success in what I trust may be a project which will be of assistance to them and the people they represent and a detriment to none of the rest of us and the people which we represent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I had the privilege of serving as a conferee in this conference, the report from which has just been presented. I wish to congratulate the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and all other members of the conference committee on the fine work that was done in conducting that

conference. It was a very difficult task. It was undertaken with finesse, skill, great tack, diplomacy, and all the other arts of statesmanship one should bring to a great task like this.

I see the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] on his feet. I congratulate him. The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] was one of the conferees. He did excellent work. Every member of the conference committee is to be congratulated upon doing a statesmanlike, perfect piece of work. This is a great day for the people who live in the Colorado River Basin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

ONE-HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1739, Senate bill 3386, and that I may be permitted to yield not to exceed 2 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3386) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt," approved July 28, 1955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This is a noncontroversial bill. On the 28th of July, 1955, Congress authorized the establishment of a commission, consisting of 15 persons, to make plans for observing the 100th anniversary of the birthday of Theodore Roosevelt. The President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 2 Members of the Senate, 2 Members of the House, and 8 persons appointed by the President at large constituted the Commission.

The members of the Commission were required to file, by the 1st of March 1956, their report on the plans. The report has been filed, and hearings were held. Now it becomes necessary to proceed within about 36 months to carry out the plans.

The pending bill is an authorization bill to authorize the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate not to exceed $461,000 to carry out the purposes set forth in the bill. There is no objection to the measure.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am in complete support of the measure. I think it very important that we give recognition to Teddy Roosevelt, and that such recognition as is contemplated in the bill be given to him by the Nation. I say most respectfully that I hope the authorities involved will ask themselves the question as to what Theodore Roosevelt, if he were alive, would think about any proposal to prevent a few piers of a bridge across the Potomac to be built on Theodore Roosevelt Island. Knowing his interest in the common people of the country, I cannot bring myself to believe that he would think he was in any way being dishonored if a part of the monument, Theodore Roosevelt Island, served as the foundation piers for a bridge.

On the contrary, I am inclined to believe that he would appreciate the building of such a highway on which human traffic would day by day cross the island dedicated to his memory, with the attention of the people called to the fact that they were crossing Theodore Roosevelt Island.

Speaking as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I have never been able to understand the opposition of some of the officials of the Commission to having a bridge touch Theodore Roosevelt Island. We have a very serious situation confronting us. I believe a great memorial bridge could be built to the memory of Theodore Roosevelt, just as the Arlington Memorial Bridge, commonly known as the Lincoln Memorial Bridge, is a great monument to Abraham Lincoln. I hope my remarks today, as I support the Senator's proposal, will at least be noted by the members of the Commission. They are completely wrong in taking the position that a Roosevelt Memorial Bridge would in someway not be a proper part of Theodore Roosevelt Island.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very happy that the Senator from Oregon has made his contribution to the support of the bill. I noted with pleasure his statement that a bridge across the southern portion of Theodore Roosevelt Island, which would be comparable to the so-called Lincoln Memorial Bridge, would be an honor to the former President. I shall be very happy someday to appear with him before the Committee on the District of Columbia in an effort to make sure that no bridge which is of less grandeur than the one he has described shall be built in that place. I hope the pending measure may be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt", approved July 28, 1955, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed the sum of $461,000 to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, as is set forth in the report of the committee:

> The committee believes it is necessary that the Centennial Commission be provided additional and adequate funds in order to accomplish the purposes set forth in the resolution creating the Commission.

With the prophetic words of Theodore Roosevelt: "The fate of the 20th century will in no small degree depend upon the type of citizenship developed on this continent," the committee believes that a proper celebration of the centennial of the death of the 26th President of the United States should make this observance a potent factor in the fight for an awakened, free, and inspired America.

TRANSFER OF TITLE TO CERTAIN LAND TO THE PUEBLO OF SAN LORENZO, N. MEX.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar 1665, H. R. 6625.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6625) to provide for the transfer of title to certain land and the improvements thereon to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo (Pueblo of Picuris), in New Mexico, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the pending bill relates to about 1¾ acres of land which the Government acquired from the Pueblo of San Lorenzo for school purposes. For that purpose it paid $600 for that piece of land. Subsequently, the Government decided not to run a day school at that location, and decided to abandon the school. The Government is now willing to surrender to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo the land which it had acquired from the pueblo.

We felt it would be of no value to have the Government in possession of an empty school building, which would be a hazard to the community. We would therefore prefer to have the land transferred back to the pueblo for its administration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to read a brief statement on the bill.

H. R. 6625 proposes to provide for the transfer of title of certain land and the improvements thereon to the pueblo of San Lorenzo in New Mexico without compensation. The property comprises four parcels of land aggregating 1.77 acres which were acquired by the United States through condemnation proceedings in 1920 and 1930 for $662 for the purpose of establishing a day school for the Indians of the pueblo of San Lorenzo.

According to the committee report, the total estimated value of the improvements on the land involved is $13,752. The improvements on the property consist of a schoolhouse, a teacherage, a clinic, a small building which houses a home-economics room and four small structures.

Arrangements have been made so that the Indian children of the pueblo attend local public schools, therefore there is no longer a necessity for the Bureau of Indian Affairs to conduct a school or for the United States to continue to hold title to the property.

As I understand, those are the bare, cold facts that are involved in this matter. The Senator from New Mexico, of

course, knows the Morse formula problem that disturbs the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. This is a piece of Federal property on which the taxpayers of the country have spent, in round figures, $13,000 by way of improvements. We are confronted by the physical fact of the property being in the middle of an Indian pueblo, which is really an Indian community. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. On an Indian reservation, I understand.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I understand further that we are also confronted with the proposition that the Indians claim they have no money.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. What confronts the Senator from Oregon, to be very frank with the Senator from New Mexico, is that he is in the position where, under any other state of facts, he would insist on the application of the Morse formula which requires that 50 percent of the appraised fair market value of the land be paid to the Government, because the property technicaly belongs to all the taxpayers of the country, and not to the Indians.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct. However, this exception should be stated. The land was acquired from the Indians for the purposes of establishing a day school. The Indians are very sensitive on the subject of ownership of land within their pueblo. They would never have allowed the condemnation of the land in the first place, except for the fact that the school was to be built on the land. Subsequently it was decided to take the children to school somewhere else. The Indians want this land returned to them.

If the Senator from Oregon were to insist on the 50-percent formula being applied, the Indians would refuse to take the property, and the property would stand as vacant property within the pueblo. I believe such a situation would do violence to the very principle the Senator from Oregon has fought for.

Mr. MORSE. As I understand, there would be even some difficulty about salvage operations because the Indians control the pueblo.

Mr. ANDERSON. This is a building that would be worthless as salvage, I may say to the Senator. The Senator knows that I have always helped him in fighting for his principle in the application of what is called the Morse formula. I assure the Senator that, so far as I know, there is no way in which that formula could be applied to this situation. Therefore the bill ought to be passed.

Mr. MORSE. That is the understanding I have as the result of my discussion with staff members of the committee. I am put in the position where there is not much that can be done about the Morse formula with respect to this rather novel and unique and exceptional fact situation.

Let me ask the Senator a question or two along this line.

I am not seeking a rationalization for a waiver of the Morse formula. I may vote against the bill when the vote is called for, but I am seeking to make a record to see if there is a distinguishable line which can be drawn. I have no desire to do an injustice to either the Indians or the taxpayers by insisting upon an application of the Morse formula if in part there is justification for not applying it.

Under the Indian policies of the Federal Government, it is true, is it not, that we have very definite Federal responsibilities and obligations which we owe the Indians in the administration of Indian affairs?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. It is true, is it not, that very frequently the various funds in the Treasury of the United States that can be used for Indian purposes are used to supply an Indian reservation with necessary seed, feed, and so on, to meet various disaster problems or special economic problems which confront the Indians?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. We frequently supply money for the digging of wells, and establishing sanitary systems as well as ordinary water systems. Those things are done for the Indians who are our awards.

Mr. MORSE. It is on the ward feature that I wish to inquire for a moment. Because of the fact that this relationship has existed ever since our treaties with the Indians were signed, whereby the Federal Government exercises what may be called a type of guardianship over the Indians as wards, we do spend a great deal of Federal money for the benefit of the Indians, whether it be the building of a school or supplying them with medical services, or libraries, or recreation facilities, or with feed, seed, and whatnot. The Federal Government frequently makes what amounts to a donation to the Indians from the standpoint of carrying out our guardianship obligations to them as our wards.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. MORSE. In this instance, what this bill can be said to be is a donation, really, that we are making to one Indian reservation over which we still have guardanship responsibility, just as we make donations to the Indians for other purposes——

Mr. ANDERSON. With this additional factor, that no other person could have built these facilities in the first place except the guardian who is looking after them. Now that the guardian no longer has use for the facilities, we think they should be surrendered back.

Mr. MORSE. During the time we operated these buildings we operated them somewhat as a tenant by suffrance. Also we operated them as a donated service to the Indians in carrying out our guardianship obligations.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. And I suppose they would have had authority at any time to cease cooperating with the Federal Government in regard to the services which the Federal Government sought to make available to the Indians through the use of these facilities.

Mr. ANDERSON. Except that they had to transfer title. They had to do that to get the building built.

Mr. MORSE. And title was transferred in the first instance for the specific purpose of the uses to which the Federal Government put the buildings.

Mr. ANDERSON. And no other.

Mr. MORSE. Now that the use is no longer going to be fulfilled, it is your position that the title should revert to the Indians?

Mr. ANDERSON. When the original bill had been passed it should have carried a provision for the reversion of the title, if the property was no longer used for school purposes. Then we would not need this bill.

Mr. MORSE. Could it not be said with complete accuracy that at the time of the original transfer of title there was the implied understanding on the part of the Indians and the Federal Government that at any time the buildings were not to be used for their original purpose the property would revert to the Indians? In other words is it not true that the Indians transferred title only to meet a technical legal requirement and the parties well understood that if the Federal Government ever abandoned the original purpose for the transfer the Indians would get back the property?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, so that no one will say in the future, "Oh, you made an exception to the Morse formula in the New Mexico case," I have raised these questions on the floor of the Senate. I wish to thank the Senator from New Mexico for the answers and information he has given to me. I am satisfied that under the facts and special circumstances of the case the Morse formula does not apply. It is clear to me that the Federal Government under its guardianship responsibilities should provide these facilities for these Indians in any event.

One of the services, I am informed by a staff member of the committee, is to use some of the structures for clinic services and some of the buildings for community-center services. We should be doing that, anyway, in carrying out our guardianship functions and obligations which we owe to these Indians.

I shall vote for the bill. I shall vote for it, because, after I have weighed all the facts in the matter, I think it can be justified on the ground that we are simply making Federal facilities available to the Indians for the carrying out of services which, under our guardianship, we should carry out anyway, and, in all probability, would carry out. Therefore, in my judgment, the bill does not, in fact, violate the spirit, the intent, and the purpose of the Morse formula.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ABOLISHMENT OF FOSSIL CYCAD NATIONAL MONUMENT, S. DAK.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1677, Senate bill 1161.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1161) to abolish the Fossil Cycad National Monument, S. Dak., and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, this bill would disestablish a national monument consisting of a 40-acre tract. The National Park Service desires to have it disestablished.

I desire to offer an amendment which would, in effect, postpone the disestablishment until September 1, 1957, so that in the interim scientific or educational institutions may remove the fossils.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out lines 3 to 7, inclusive, and insert the following:

That, effective September 1, 1957, the Fossil Cycad National Monument, S. Dak., is hereby abolished, and the lands contained therein shall be administered thereafter by the Secretary of the Interior as public lands in accordance with the public-land laws of the United States: *Provided*, That prior thereto the Secretary of the Interior may, under such regulations as he determines to be appropriate, issue permits to scientific and educational institutions for the discovery, excavation, and removal of fossil cycads for scientific and educational purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have not had an opportunity to study this measure, but my understanding of it leads me to the conclusion that it does not involve transferring title to the land. It is simply a transfer of the use of the land from a monument purpose to other purposes, under the control of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. It is only a 40-acre tract, and the Government will still retain control over it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, effective September 1, 1957, the Fossil Cycad National Monument, S. Dak., is hereby abolished, and the lands contained therein shall be administered thereafter by the Secretary of the Interior as public lands in accordance with the public-land laws of the United States: *Provided*, That prior thereto the Secretary of the Interior may, under such regulations as he determines to be appropriate, issue permits to scientific and educational institutions for the discovery, excavation, and removal of fossil cycads for scientific and educational purposes; and

That if any excavations on such lands for the recovery of fissionable materials or any other minerals should be undertaken, such fossil remains discovered shall become the property of the Federal Government.

EASTER ADJOURNMENT—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a concurrent resolution relative to the Easter adjournment, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 226, which the clerk will state for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, March 29, 1956, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 9, 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 226) was considered and agreed to.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO SUBMIT REPORTS DURING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committees of the Senate be authorized to submit reports to the Secretary of the Senate during the Easter adjournment from March 29 to April 9, 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN TITANIUM

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the very fine paper reviewing the history and present status of research and development in titanium given before AIME, on March 6, 1956, by Mr. John H. Garrett, of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Research and Development.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TITANIUM SITUATION

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

We sometimes hear the thought expressed that the Government is placing too much research and development emphasis on titanium in relation to other metals. Consideration of the principles which underlie all of our materials research and development effort will show why titanium has, I think properly, received such favored treatment.

One of the most difficult aspects of management of the defense research and development program is determination of the relative emphasis which should be placed on different parts of the program. The objective of research management is to obtain the maximum contribution to the defense effort, in relation to the resources expanded. In applying this principle to the materials research program, a second principle comes to the front. This is, that Government resources will usually be applied only in areas which will not be supported directly by industry. Since the industrial research program on materials is very large in the aggregate, the Government program must be very selective, in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of work supported by industry.

Is there any general rule by which we can differentiate between materials research which industry might be expected to accomplish, and materials research which must be supported, if at all, by the Government? There appears to be such a rule, of quite general application. Industry will chiefly support materials development in areas where it is able to assess the size of the market for successfully developed products. This means, of necessity, an industrial or civilian market. Industry does not feel that it can judge the magnitude of the future military market, since it is completely dependent upon the vagaries of national and international politics. It is for this reason that industrial facilities required for military products, such as airplane, guided missile and ammunition plants, are chiefly financed by the Government.

In the field of metals, titanium alone among general purpose structural metals, will be used almost exclusively in military products during the foreseeable future. In the case of steel and aluminum, for example, something like 95 percent of current production is for nonmilitary use. With titanium, on the other hand, less than 5 percent goes into civilian products. Under these circumstances, it is evident that a large government research program on steel or alumium should not be necessary, and conversely, if there is to be a large research effort on titanium, it must be government-supported.

Financing titanium research

With these principles established, it is possible to develop a basis for judging the appropriate level of a government-supported titanium research and development program. In a well established, but progressive, business it is considered appropriate to budget 5 percent of sales for product development. In a business dependent upon new and difficult technology, as is titanium, probably a research and development budget equal to at least 10 percent of gross would be more reasonable.

Let us estimate the gross government investment in titanium during 1956. In round figures, some 5,000 tons of mill product will be produced. The value of this titanium in final fabricated form might be estimated at $20 a pound, of $40,000 a ton. The 5,000 tons would then cost some $200 million. In addition, several thousands tons of sponge will be purchased by the government under existing commitments, at about $7,000 a ton. The total cost of government procurement of titanium will therefore in all probability amount to about $250 million during 1956. If we take 10 percent as a reasonable level of research and development expenditure, we would have $25 million.

The level of identifiable goverment support for fiscal year 1956 is about $16 million, of which some $4 million is for research, $3,500,000 for the sheet rolling program, $7,500,000 for experimental fabrication and $1 million for the Titanium Metallurgical Laboratory. In addition, the aircraft and engine industries will spend some part of their product improvement funds on titanium applications, so that the total government expenditure should be close to the $25 million figure.

Review of Government titanium activities

Before discussing the present status of titanium, it is useful to review the history of the development, in order to understand the

reasons for the various actions that have been taken.

Although titanium is the fourth most common structural metal in the earth's crust, it was strictly a laboratory curiosity until after World War II. The first Defense Department sponsored work on titanium was accomplished by Battelle in 1946 as part of the Air Force Rand project. This was followed by Bureau of Aeronautics efforts starting in 1947 and Army Ordnance work about the same time. All of these early efforts were small, being principally exploratory in nature. During this period the Bureau of Mines carried on a sustained effort laying the groundwork of knowledge of extractive metallurgy on which the present industry is based.

The first big boost to titanium came in 1951 when Army Ordnance allocated over $2 million to the support of titanium research, a considerable part of which was expended for procurement of sponge from the Bureau of Mines and titanium products from the infant titanium industry.

During the 5-year period from inception of interest in titanium as a structural metal in 1947-52, a great deal of fundamental knowledge of the characteristics of titanium was gained, but the industry was not able to turn out a uniform high-quality product which would meet the standards of the aircraft industry. The level of production climbed steadily to about 1,000 tons per year, and then faltered at that point because the aircraft industry was apparently not able to put the metal to use in production quantities. The halt in the growth of sales was then understood to be due to two basic factors. First, the aircraft and engine people were fearful that they would not be able to obtain adequate quantities of the metal if airplanes and engines were committed to its use. Second, the level of production in each producer's plant was too small to permit development of adequate production controls, in order to assure production of mill products of the required quality and uniformity.

At this crucial stage in the growth of the titanium industry, it is fortunate that there were enthusiastic supporters of the importance of titanium in all three services. Among these were Colonel Mesick in Army Ordnance, Mr. Promisel in the Bureau of Aeronautics and General Metzger and Colonel Dick in the Air Force. Had it not been for the faith of these and others in various places in the Defense Department in the ultimate success of the titanium program, the effort might well have been dropped.

It is interesting to note that when decisions were made involving the commitment of millions, and even hundreds of millions, in the titanium program, no one in the Defense Department had any specific knowledge, based on engineering studies, of the advantages to be gained from use of titanium in aircraft structures. Such engineering studies have only recently been made on a broad basis. At that time (around 1952) our chief basis for believing in the ultimate usefulness of titanium was a comparison of its mechanical properties with those of alternative materials. The high-strength, corrosion-resistant steels were not then available and the properties of titanium looked very good. Had the steel industry developed these alloys five years earlier, I doubt if the decision to go ahead with a major titanium effort would have been made.

Sponge production program

Early in 1952 a committee on materials was formed within the Research and Development Board organization. Much of the time of this committee was devoted to the perrenial problem, titanium. In the summer of 1952 it recommended a course of action that was to have far-reaching consequences. It had concluded that the difficulties besetting the industry were primarily due to the inability to process titanium into mill products on a continuous basis, in order to learn how to establish adequate control of product quality. A survey was made of the potential use of titanium over a 3-year period, assuming that all quality problems were overcome. This survey indicated that 35,000 tons per year of sponge might be needed after 3 years. The committee then took the bull by the horns, and recommended that the necessary steps be taken to build up sponge capacity to 35,000 tons by 1955. This was reduced by ODM to an initial goal of 25,000 tons by 1956, and subsequently further downward adjustments have been made.

This was the origin of the Government sponge support program. Certain errors and omissions in connection with this action are the cause of some of the subsequent problems which have been encountered.

In the first place, the difficulties encountered by the producers were not confined to the sponge production stage. While the sponge produced at that time would now be considered to contain an unacceptable level of impurities, the principal difficulties affecting the quality of mill products were in the melting and fabrication stages. Action taken to build up sponge production would not help solve the problems of subsequent stages in the process.

Secondly, no account was taken of the lead time between the time when a material with satisfactory properties becomes available and the time it can be procured in quantities for production use. This lead time is the time required to obtain complete engineering data, fabricate and test experimental components, and design, fabricate and test prototypes. For such complex structures as aircraft, this period can easily cover from 3 to 6 years, or even more where the effort is small.

It was therefore no surprise that use of sponge in mill products failed to reach the level of even the reduced sponge program.

About a year ago, when the gap between the sponge production rate established by the Government, and the rate of use by industry became uncomfortably large, a new plan was adopted. Recognizing that in the early stages of application of titanium, it is difficult to make accurate estimates of consumption more than a year ahead, whereas 2 or more years are required to plan and construct added sponge capacity, it was decided that a factor of safety of 100 percent should be added to forecasts of consumption. Since, even with this factor of safety, use of sponge would be somewhat less than the planned rate of expansion under the old program, certain of the planned increments of production were postponed.

The growth of consumption of titanium is being very closely watched, with new estimates being made every 3 months, so that we will be able to take timely action to raise production goals in ample time to prevent a sponge bottleneck.

Titanium Metallurgical Laboratory

A very significant event in the history of the titanium industry was the establishment, a year ago, of the Titanium Metallurgical Laboratory at Battelle Memorial Institute. During the summer of 1954 the Secretary of Defense became concerned with the magnitude of the problems confronting the titanium and aircraft industries, which were preventing a desirable rate of introduction of titanium into the construction of military aircraft. He requested the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Research and Development) to take appropriate action to correct this situation. After consulting with a number of his senior advisers, Mr. Quarles concluded that two steps should be taken. The first was establishment of a titanium laboratory to undertake research of a short-range nature on urgent problems and to provide technical consulting services to industry and the Department of Defense on titanium metallurgy.

The second step was the organization of a group to exercise greater leadership and coordination in the Department of Defense titanium program. This group is the so-called titanium steering group.

The operation of the laboratory has centered around four phases of activity:

1. Collection and dissemination of technical information on titanium.
2. Advice to the steering group to assist in formulating the D. O. D. titanium program.
3. Special tasks, investigations, and surveys on important problems.
4. Technical consulting services to industry.

Much effort during this first year of operation of the laboratory has gone into the organization of the information center. The laboratory has attempted to obtain copies of all existing reports on Government and Government-sponsored research and development on titanium. There are about 200 such research projects currently in existence, and an additional four-hundred-odd projects have been completed. From these projects, approximately 1,400 reports have been collected. Technical literature for the past 50 years was screened, and abstracts and full texts of important articles have been obtained. Arrangements have been made for the laboratory to secure, as they are issued, copies of all reports on current Government-sponsored research. The laboratory is also monitoring current technical literature throughout the world for information on titanium. Approximately 1,250 journals are being monitored either directly or through various abstracting services. In addition, a systematic effort has been started to collect nonproprietary information from private research and other private sources, as well as the mass of unorganized and unreported data which has been accumulated by industry.

All of this mass of information is organized in such a way that all information pertinent to a particular subject may be found on one place in the files. These files are available to anyone having a legitimate interest in defense applications of titanium. Access to the information may be either by a letter of inquiry or by a personal visit to the Laboratory. In addition, the more significant information is summarized in a series of state-of-the-art reports covering selected aspects of titanium metallurgy. About 15 such reports have been issued and 20 more are under preparation. These reports are distributed to a mailing list containing over 600 names.

In addition to the operation of the Information Center, the Laboratory is engaged in a wide variety of activities serving both industry and the Government. One of the most interesting of these activities involves a study, in cooperation with the Aircraft Structural Materials Subcommittee of NACA and the ANC–5 Committee, of the true nature of design data required by aircraft designers. It would require a prodigious amount of effort to secure mechanical property data covering yield and ultimate strengths in tension and compression, as well as values for ductility, bearing strength and other properties even at room temperature for a wide range of titanium alloys. When you multiply this by the amount of additional data required to cover a broad range of elevated temperatures, as well as short time and transient conditions, you can see what an imposing task faces us in supplying quickly the sort of information designers are accustomed to using for conventional materials.

An analysis of conventional mechanical property data, such as tensile strengths and elongations, revealed that these are imaginary concepts having no fundamental meaning in relation to structural design. An effort is being made to see if there are not more fundamental values which could be established by relatively few tests on each new alloy, and from which conventional properties could be computed. If such a shortcut

can be found, it will save millions of dollars and months, if not years, of time in furnishing essential data.

Titanium technology

So much for an account of how we got where we are. I would like to make a few remarks on the current state of titanium technology.

As far as I know all production applications of titanium (with one minor exception) use the metal in the annealed condition. The alloys commercially available, of which there are 5 in general use, have a minimum guaranteed yield strength ranging from 110,000 to 130,000 pounds per square inch. Four of these alloys are of the alpha-beta type, and therefore capable of strengthening by heat treatment. Typical annealed strenghths are from 5,000 to 30,000 pounds per square inch above the specification value, and one of the problems of titanium producers is to try to narrow this range. This variation in strength is a major cause of difficulty in fabricating titanium. It also penalizes titanium unduly in relation to other materials, because it is necessary to use the low side of the range of typical strengths, for design calculations.

Since practically all titanium is used as annealed, a comparison of the strength of annealed titanium with steel and aluminum of equivalent weight is of interest. While for aircraft design purposes the tensile yield is not very significant, it is convenient to use for purposes of comparison. Titanium at 120,000 pounds per square inch and 0.165 pounds per cubic inch density is approximately equivalent to aluminum at 73,000 pounds per square inch, and steel at 175,000 pounds per square inch. The annealed titanium competes fairly well with high strength heat treated alloys of aluminum or steel.

In order to obtain the full advantage of titanium in aircraft design it is necessary to heat treat the alpha-beta alloys to the strength levels of which they are capable. We do not have enough information to know what strength can be expected on a commercial basis either as typical values or minimum specification values. Laboratory experiments have shown that any of the alloys can be heat treated to yield strengths ranging from 170,000 to 190,000 pounds per square inch or higher, while retaining elongation of around 10 percent. For the sheet rolling program we are sponsoring, the objective is to reach 160,000 pounds per square inch yield as the minimum guaranteed value at room temperature, with uniform elongation of 10 percent and 105,000 pounds per square inch at 800° F. Typical values will probably be 170,000 pounds per square inch at room temperature and 115,000 pounds per square inch at 800° F. Equivalent room temperature values would be 102,000 pounds per square inch for aluminum and 300,000 pounds per square inch for steel. This compares with available typical yield strength of 72,000 pounds per square inch for aluminum alloy and 170,000 for steel (with, however, only 5 percent elongation). It is comparisons such as these that keep our enthusiasm for titanium alive in the face of discouragingly high prices and technical problems.

A great deal of work is being accomplished to develop improved alloys to overcome the shortcomings of the alloys which are commercially available. Some of these difficulties are nonuniformity of distribution of alloying elements in the ingot, poor formability in sheet, susceptibility to hydrogen embrittlement, and instability at elevated temperatures. The popular alloying elements around which many of the newer alloys are developed are aluminum, vanadium, and molybdenum.

Aluminum, which is an alpha-stabilizer, contributes to high-temperature strength. By the same token, alloys containing high percentages of aluminum are difficult to roll into sheet. Molybdenum and vanadium are beta-stabilizers and seem to confer a better combination of strength and ductility than some of the other beta-stabilizers such as iron and chromium. A very important characteristic of these elements is the tolerance to hydrogen which they seem to confer to the alloys.

The first alloy in the new series to reach commercial importance is the 6Al–4V alloy. This was originally developed as a bar and forging alloy. More recently there has been intense interest in its use as a sheet alloy because of the very good properties that can be obtained through heat treatment. The relatively high aluminum content has made this a difficult alloy to roll into sheet, and there are other problems inherent in this alloy in sheet form, such as difficulty in controlling oxygen content.

Some mention should be made of the sheet rolling program being sponsored by the Titanium Steering Group and administered by the Bureau of Aeronautics. This is an effort to accelerate, perhaps by several years, the availability of improved alloys in sheet form to meet the present needs of aircraft designers. A careful selection has been made among candidate alloys for large scale experimentation. For each of the alloys selected, contracts are being negotiated with two producers to produce the alloys in selected gages on a full commercial scale with the objective of meeting the target mechanical properties. These properties represent the highest level which it is believed can be successfully met in the present state of the art. At the same time, they are high enough to meet the essential needs of aircraft designers, and to place them well out in front of competing materials. The alloys which have been tentatively selected are 4Al–2V–1Cr–1Mo, 3Al–6Mo, 4½Al–3Mo–1V. A good look is also being taken at the 6Al–4V, in spite of the known fabricating difficulties, because of its excellent heat-treated strength possibilities and its low density.

It might be of interest to diverge for a moment to discuss the question of density in titanium alloys. At first glance, one would think that the difference between the density of the 6A1 4V alloy (0.162 pounds per cubic inch) and the 4½ A1–3Mo–1V (0.168 pounds per cubic inch) would not be significant. A calculation has been made for a particular airplane now in the design stage, showing that, other things being equal, substitution of the heavier alloy would add 80,000 pounds to the gross weight of the airplane. This heavy penalty is due to the operation of the well-known principle of growth in aircraft design. In this airplane the growth factor was unusually high—15. Because of the great importance of density, there are real advantages in basing alloy development on aluminum and vanadium, rather than iron, chromium, or molybdenum. Another way of saying this is that use of the heavier alloying elements must be accompanied by advantages which will offset their added weight.

Practically all present applications of titanium are in pieces originally designed for steel, where substitution of titanium is deemed worth the cost because of the saving in weight through direct substitution. In this type of application advantage cannot be taken of the growth factor, as when a new design is under consideration, and the cost of the weight saving is likely to be very high in terms of dollars per pound. Because of this high cost per pound of weight saved, titanium is only used in airplanes which are substantially overweight, so that a few pounds saving in weight is worth a great many dollars. As all such applications of titanium confer marginal benefits, and it would be possible to substitute back to steel if necessary, the titanium industry is at present on a hand-to-mouth basis. Not until titanium is incorporated in major elements of a new design—so that the airplane will be fully committed to titanium—will the benefits of large-scale production of titanium be gained.

There is no airplane currently scheduled for production which uses substantial amounts of titanium in its original design. There are several reasons for this, but they all add up to one thing—the industry has not had enough experience with the newer strong titanium alloys to commit themselves beyond the point of no return. What is needed is (1) more design data and (2) more experience with fabrication and test of these alloys in structural elements.

It should be recognized that this inability to use a theoretically more desirable material results in a combination of two undesirable effects on our military equipment—it increases the weight of the equipment, and reduces the performance of which the equipment will be capable. Both of these effects are distinct military handicaps which can be minimized by adequate remedial measures. The specific causes of titanium difficulties are becoming more evident. If these causes could have been identified, and appropriate measures taken 2 or 3 years ago, titanium would today be much nearer to massive use, which would have been greatly to the benefit of our aircraft programs.

Another possible obstacle is the lack of specialized facilities for fabricating titanium mill products. All titanium mill products are now produced on equipment designed for handling another metal—generally steel. The requirements for titanium are not the same as for the other metals. Differences involve rolling temperatures, amount and effect of scaling in heating furnaces, rate of reduction or speed of extrusion, pickling and other descaling procedures, annealing temperatures and furnace atmospheres, and, in fact, practically every detail of mill-product-fabricating procedure. It can, therefore, only be considered a makeshift situation to intersperse orders for titanium and steel (or aluminum or brass), using the same equipment and the same labor force. The early use of higher strength alloys—which will increase the demands on mill equipment—makes this question of facilities particularly urgent.

The structure of the titanium industry is such that it will be a very slow process for the industry to establish, with its own resources alone, the type of integrated specialized titanium facilities which would seem to be desirable. There are four independent organizations offering complete lines of titanium rolled products, and a number of others experimenting with production of extrusions or other special forms. With total business of less than 2,000 tons annually, divided among this number of plants, it has not been feasible for any of the companies to establish separate titanium facilities. If it is the desire of the Government to have titanium available for all useful military applications, it may be necessary to provide a certain amount of direct financial assistance toward procurement of production facilities.

At the present time the Materials Advisory Board is studying the adequacy of existing titanium fabricating facilities. It is hoped that the report, which should be available in about 6 weeks, will clarify the extent to which direct Government assistance in financing capital equipment would assist in meeting Defense Department titanium requirements.

There has been a notable increase in interest in titanium within the aircraft and engine industries during the past year. This appears to have been due to the combined influence of the following factors:

1. Clearing up of certain technical deficiencies in titanium alloys;

2. Completion of further engineering calculations showing the weight advantages to be gained from use of titanium in aircraft;

3. Wide dissemination of technical information through the titanium metallurgical laboratory;

4. Improvement in quality of mill products provided by the titanium industry; and

5. Favorable service experience with titanium.

In spite of the accelerated degree of acceptance of titanium, we are only on the threshold of development and use of this metal. The total research and testing expenditures on titanium from all sources is only a minute fraction of that which has been expended on steel or aluminum. As a consequence, only a bare beginning has been made in obtaining the voluminous data, not to mention service experience, which engineers must have before titanium can take its place as a routine material of construction.

REGULATION OF USE BY MOTOR CARRIERS OF CERTAIN MOTOR VEHICLES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 898) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the use by motor carriers (under leases, contracts, or other arrangements) of motor vehicles not owned by them, in the furnishing of transportation of property.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to express my gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] for permitting the Senate to dispose of certain bills while a number of Senators were on the floor.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 1, line 6, after the letter "(e)", to strike out "The" and insert "Subject to the provisions of subsection (f) hereof, the"; on page 2, line 16, after the word "regulations", to insert "as if they were the owners of such vehicles"; in line 19, after the word "and", to strike out "equipment; but nothing" and insert "equipment and inspection thereof, which requirements may include but shall not be limited to promulgation of regulations requiring liability and cargo insurance covering all such equipment"; at the beginning of line 24, to insert "(f) Nothing"; on page 3, line 2, after the word "vehicle", to insert "with driver"; in line 3, after the word "such", to strike out "use." and insert "use—."

The next amendment of the committee was, after line 3, to insert:

"(1) where the motor vehicle so to be used is that of a farmer or of a cooperative association or a federation of cooperative associations, as specified in section 203 (b) (4a) or (5), or is that of a private carrier of property by motor vehicle as defined in section 203 (a) (17), and such motor vehicle is to be used by the motor carrier in a single movement or in one or more of a series of movements, loaded or empty, in the general direction of the general area in which such motor vehicle is based; or

"(2) where the motor vehicle so to be used is one which has completed a movement covered by section 203 (b) (6) and such motor vehicle is next to be used by the motor carrier in a loaded movement in any direction, and/or in one or more of a series of movements, loaded or empty, in the general direction of the general area in which such motor vehicle is based.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 9, after the numerals "(17)", it is proposed to insert "and is used regularly in the transportation of processed or manufactured perishable commodities or products of the character referred to in section 203 (b) (6)."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, before explaining the purpose of the amendment, I should like to comment briefly on the purpose of the proposed legislation. The subject has been very adequately covered by the distinguished junior Senator from Florida, but the bill has been a matter of much complexity and controversy since he has been a Member of the Senate, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and I can testify that that was true long before that. The subject has been a problem in our whole transportation system for a long time.

I do not know how many hours have been taken, or the number of conferences which the Members of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have had, not only with farm groups, but also with transportation and trucking groups, railroad organizations, and everyone else involved in the matter.

The junior Senator from Florida has done yeoman work on the bill. He has discussed the many facets of it. I could not help thinking, when consideration of this bill was interrupted in order to discuss the Colorado River bill, that the trip-leasing problem has more facets than the Colorado River has tributaries.

It is very difficult to prepare a bill which will satisfy completely the various segments of the transportation industry which are involved. Although the United States has the finest transportation system in the world, we have a national transportation problem. Without our transportation system, the economy of the country could not exist. Without it, we could not adequately prepare our defenses.

The transportation industry has grown and has become healthy and strong mainly because there has been competent regulation of the transportation system.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is, I believe, the oldest of the regulatory commissions which have been established in the Government. It was created upon the theory that in the whole surface-transportation system, some rules of government would be required.

Our transportation system is in even more need of rules of the game today because it is constantly growing. I do not know how many Senators realize it, but the fact is that 1 out of every 18 persons who are employed in the United States work for some part of the transportation systems of the country.

Of the gross national product of close to $400 billion, the transportation industry contributes more than $70 billion to the national economy; and of the $70 billion, $67 billion is represented by the transportation agencies which are regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

As the Senator from Florida has pointed out, the Interstate Commerce Commission has made many mistakes, but they have dealt with difficult, complex problems. Some of their rulings have not been consistent. I think the Senator from Florida stated the situation correctly when he said that farm groups have complained because some of the rulings of the Commission with respect to agricultural products have been inconsistent. That has caused much trouble.

In fairness to the Commission, though, and I think the Senator from Ohio will agree with me, much of the delay has been caused by the fact that the entire matter has been in controversy in Congress for a long time. I hope, as the Senator from Florida has said, that the bill will be passed. After many weeks of consultation, conference, and compromise, I think a much better bill has been drafted than was originally proposed. The present bill fits into our national transportation policy better than the original bill. I wish to compliment the Senator from Florida in that regard, because he actually had to umpire a tug of war between the different interests concerned, as did the Senator from Ohio and other members of the committee, including the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], who is seated beside me.

Finally, we reached the point where there was only one major controversy. Everyone agreed that the farmer should be exempt, so that he could haul his own products. Everyone agreed that if a private trucker could get agricultural products and haul them to a destination, both he and the farmer should have the right to trip lease their trucks home.

But there was some disagreement as to how the farmer should go home. Finally, the committee came to an agreement that he at least ought to return in the general direction of his home. If he had taken a load of oranges from Florida to New York, he at least should not return to Florida by way of Oklahoma.

Thus the committee came to many agreements, but there was no definition of what a private carrier could do. The two words "private carrier" caused much controversy. I think the Senate ought to know how important this matter is to a regulated transportation system.

The trucking system of the United States now carries close to 62 percent of the gross tonnage of our national economy. This tonnage has grown rapidly and is growing faster. That is why it is necessary to have a national policy or system of regulation of the trucking industry, while still not injuring the farmer. No one wants to do that. The senior Senator from Washington has never, to his knowledge, ever stood on the floor of either the Senate or the House and voted against a bill which he thought was in the interest of the farmer who owned the trucks. Because there has been an exemption for

farmers to haul their products in their own farm trucks, there has been a healthy growth in the production of farm products. Normally, the farm trucks are not for hire.

There has been a healthy growth of the trucking industry. Three million trucks are owned as farm trucks. Sometimes they are for hire. There are trucks used in the U-Drive industry. Normally they are subject only to the regulations and laws of the road.

One million, three hundred thousand trucks comprise the bulk of our common carrier system. Four million trucks comprise the big bulk of private carriers. These are the ones we are talking about.

I think the Senator from Florida made his position clear in the hearings, near the end of June, when he said:

Senator SMATHERS. Of course, that is all we are trying to do, is to make it possible for the genuine agricultural trucker to be able to trip lease coming home. * * *

So that he can get back and haul some more agriculture.

We are not interested in making this so that truckers who are not legitimate agricultural haulers can just take off and go around the country. We are not interested in letting those fellows run without regulation.

We think they should be regulated, and we think they deserve to be regulated; but we do not want to interfere with the movement of fruit and vegetables and things like that, as they are moved into the markets.

That is the problem I see.

I think that is a correct statement. The bill does not define private carriers. As the bill now stands, a private carrier can travel all over the country. One of the trucks can haul shoes from Connecticut to New Jersey, and then take a load of bed springs from New Jersey to Minneapolis, and then go to Dallas, Tex., with some other products, and then move into Los Angeles, and finally get back to Connecticut. I do not think anyone believes that should be allowed to happen.

What we are trying to do is give the farmer the best protection he can have, because his business is seasonal. He needs trip-leasing.

The amendment provides that somewhere along the line that the private carrier moves his trip must have some connection with agricultural products. Such products are not literally defined as the ICC defines them. It was pointed out, as an extraordinary case, that the ICC has said that when a chicken is plucked, it is a chicken no longer, or that when milk is processed into the form of cheese, it is not an agricultural product.

The language of my amendment is:

And is used regularly in the transportation of processed or manufactured perishable commodities or products of the character referred to in section 203 (b) (6).

That defines the products we are talking about in connection with private carriers.

I have discussed the amendment with the Senator from Florida and other Senators. While I do not speak for them, I think I can truthfully say that the amendment is necessary, and that the amendment is in line not only with the general philosophy of the bill, but makes maximum transportation facilities available to the farmers of the country at the lowest possible cost, without at the same time seriously injuring the common carriers, which are the backbone of the transportation system.

Most of us on the committee had been concerned with the private-carrier provision of the bill as it now stands. As it stands, it would authorize the private carriers to go around the country without ever having hauled a single agricultural product. The trip-leasing benefits of the bill are extended to these private carriers without their ever having contributed in any way to the objective the bill seeks to attain.

I pointed out previously that there are 4 million private trucks in the country.

The amendment provides that the trip-leasing benefits are available to a private carrier whose truck is used "regularly in the transportation of processed or manufactured perishable commodities of the character referred to in section 203 (b) (6)." Section 203 (b) (6) is the section that exempts agricultural products, including livestock, poultry, and fish. So the amendment would extend the benefits of trip leasing to private carriers who transport processed or manufactured perishable products from agricultural commodities, livestock, fish—I call this to the attention of the Senator from Maine—or poultry.

In other words, a private carrier who uses his equipment regularly to haul dressed poultry, dressed meat, milk, butter, fish, or similar perishables processed or manufactured from agricultural commodities could trip lease home in accordance with the provisions of the bill. I think that would give the farmer more transportation in the long run.

I believe my amendment to be a fair one. The bill does not resolve all the problems. It will still have to go to the House. The House will hold adequate hearings.

I have discussed the amendment with members of the committee. I am sure the Senate will be doing the fair thing if it sends the bill in its present shape to the House, after all the work has been done on it, containing the proposal I suggest.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to ask two questions. In my State there are many small farmers who raise their products and send them to processors. We have in my State the Seabrook Farms, an organization which processes frozen and canned goods. The Campbell Soup people are also in my State, and they can vegetables which are obtained from the farmers. They are big processors, who, for the most part, have their own trucks.

It is my understanding that the amendment of the Senator from Washington would mean that private carriers who haul agricultural commodities or manufactured perishable goods made from such exempt agricultural products on the original trip would be allowed to trip-lease home. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. I may add, further, that they would be encouraged to do so.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. There seems to be some confusion as to carrying of manufactured products, such as canned goods, on the original trip. If the amendment is adopted, will both carriers to whom I have made reference be allowed to trip-lease home if they have carried canned goods, such as canned soups, on their original trip?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Canned goods would not necessarily be in the nature of perishables. If there is some confusion about that question, let us take the case of the Campbell Soup people in the Senator's own State. Let us assume the firm makes a haul to Chicago. It would have a right, under the general rules of the ICC, to lease its truck for the trip back, in any event. It will still be able to do that.

I assume the interested parties in the Senator's State were interested in whether or not the amendment would in any way limit their right to do that.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would not.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator for his explanation and for his reply to my questions.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington indulge me again?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There are present two persons on the floor who are interested in the Treasury-Post Office appropriation conference report. They are way ahead of schedule. They have done a wonderful job. If it can be taken up at this time, they can dispose of it very promptly. Since the Senator from Washington has been detained so long that he cannot leave anyway, I wonder if he would indulge me so that the conference report can be considered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have missed my last plane to Seattle for today, so I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9064) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of March 27, 1956, p. 5765, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the committee action on the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, 1957, H. R. 9064

Appropriation title	1956 appropriations	Estimated increased pay costs, H. Docs. 330 and 341	Estimated total, 1956	1957 estimates	House bill	House bill compared with—		Restoration or amendment requested	Senate subcommittee recommendation	Senate full committee recommendation	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
						1956 appropriation	1957 estimate					
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Treasury Department:												
Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses	$2,680,000	$170,000	$2,850,000	$2,922,000	$2,900,000	+$220,000	−$22,000		$2,900,000	$2,900,000	$2,900,000	$2,900,000
Bureau of Accounts:												
Salaries and expenses	[1] 2,785,000	126,000	2,911,000	2,950,000	2,925,000	+140,000	−25,000		2,925,000	2,925,000	2,925,000	2,925,000
Division of Disbursement: Salaries and expenses	15,475,000	280,000	15,755,000	16,240,000	16,100,000	+625,000	−140,000		16,100,000	16,100,000	16,100,000	16,100,000
Total, Bureau of Accounts	18,260,000	406,000	18,666,000	19,190,000	19,025,000	+765,000	−165,000		19,025,000	19,025,000	19,025,000	19,025,000
Bureau of the Public Debt	44,500,000	752,000	45,252,000	45,500,000	45,500,000	+1,000,000			45,500,000	45,500,000	45,500,000	45,500,000
Office of the Treasurer, United States: Salaries and expenses	15,000,000	175,000	15,175,000	15,125,000	15,125,000	+125,000			15,125,000	15,125,000	15,125,000	15,125,000
Bureau of Customs: Salaries and expenses	41,200,000	2,855,000	44,055,000	44,500,000	44,250,000	+3,050,000	−250,000		44,250,000	44,250,000	44,250,000	44,250,000
Internal Revenue Service: Salaries and expenses	282,250,000	17,900,000	300,150,000	307,850,000	305,000,000	+22,750,000	−2,850,000		305,000,000	305,000,000	305,000,000	305,000,000
Bureau of Narcotics: Salaries and expenses	2,990,000	155,000	3,145,000	3,250,000	3,250,000	+260,000			3,250,000	3,250,000	3,250,000	3,250,000
U. S. Secret Service:												
Salaries and expenses	2,960,000	179,000	3,139,000	3,374,000	3,340,000	+380,000	−34,000		3,340,000	3,340,000	3,340,000	3,340,000
Salaries and expenses, White House Police	800,000	57,000	857,000	859,000	859,000	+59,000			859,000	859,000	859,000	859,000
Salaries and expenses, guard force	268,000	17,000	285,000	287,000	285,000	+17,000	−2,000		285,000	285,000	285,000	285,000
Total, U. S. Secret Service	4,028,000	253,000	4,281,000	4,520,000	4,484,000	+456,000	−36,000		4,484,000	4,484,000	4,484,000	4,484,000
Bureau of the Mint: Salaries and expenses	3,650,000		3,650,000	3,650,000	3,650,000				3,650,000	3,650,000	3,650,000	3,650,000
U. S. Coast Guard:												
Operating expenses	[2] 160,750,000		160,750,000	165,350,000	164,850,000	+4,100,000	−500,000		164,850,000	164,850,000	164,850,000	164,850,000
Acquisition, construction, and improvement	7,000,000		7,000,000	7,500,000	7,400,000	+400,000	−100,000		7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000
Retired pay	[3] 23,900,000		23,900,000	25,400,000	24,500,000	+600,000	−900,000		24,500,000	24,500,000	24,500,000	24,500,000
Reserve training	[4] 3,403,000		3,403,000	[5] 3,750,000	3,500,000	+97,000	−250,000		3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Total, Coast Guard	195,053,000		195,053,000	202,000,000	200,250,000	+5,197,000	−1,750,000		200,250,000	200,250,000	200,250,000	200,250,000
Total, Treasury Department	609,611,000		609,611,000	648,507,000	643,434,000	+33,823,000	−5,073,000	[6] Language	643,434,000	643,434,000	643,434,000	643,434,000
Post Office Department:												
Administration	15,500,000		15,500,000	20,000,000	19,000,000	+3,500,000	−1,000,000	$1,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000
Operations	1,870,000,000		1,870,000,000	2,118,880,000	2,108,000,000	+238,000,000	−10,880,000	10,880,000	2,118,880,000	2,118,880,000	2,118,880,000	2,113,440,000
Transportation	661,620,500		661,620,500	655,000,000	645,000,000	−16,620,500	−10,000,000	10,000,000	655,000,000	655,000,000	655,000,000	650,000,000
Finance	17,200,000		17,200,000	12,945,000	12,900,000	−4,300,000	−45,000		12,900,000	12,900,000	12,900,000	12,900,000
Facilities	157,400,000		157,400,000	193,175,000	189,000,000	+31,600,000	−4,175,000	4,175,000	189,000,000	189,000,000	189,000,000	189,000,000
Total, Post Office Department	2,721,720,500		2,721,720,500	3,000,000,000	2,973,900,000	+252,179,500	−26,100,000	26,055,000	2,994,780,000	2,994,780,000	2,994,780,000	2,984,340,000
Tax Court of the United States	1,170,000	48,000	1,218,000	1,365,000	1,365,000	+195,000			1,365,000	1,365,000	1,365,000	1,365,000
Grand total, Treasury and Post Office Departments and Tax Court	3,332,501,500	22,714,000	3,355,215,500	3,649,872,000	3,618,699,000	+286,197,500	−31,173,000	26,055,000	3,639,579,000	3,639,579,000	3,639,579,000	3,629,139,000

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

[Limitation on amount of corporate funds to be expended]

Corporation or activity	Authorization, 1956	Estimated increase, 1956	Estimated total, 1956	Estimates, 1957	House allowance	House allowance compared with—		Restoration requested	Recommended by Senate subcommittee	Recommended by Senate full committee	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
						Authorization, 1956	Estimates, 1957					
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Federal Facilities Corporation	$975,000		$975,000	$250,000	$250,000	−$725,000			$250,000	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,400,000	$85,000	1,485,000	1,060,000	1,060,000	−340,000			1,060,000	1,060,000	1,060,000	1,060,000
Total	2,375,000	85,000	2,460,000	1,310,000	1,310,000	−1,065,000			1,310,000	1,310,000	1,310,000	1,310,000

[1] Includes $185,000 in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1956.
[2] Includes $7,000,000 in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1956.
[3] Includes $2,600,000 in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1956.
[4] Includes $228,000 in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1956.
[5] Excludes $3,500,000 budget amendment in H. Doc. 326.
[6] Two language amendments proposed by Washington Plate Printers Union affecting Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the conferees were unanimously in favor of the report. The report was signed by all the Senate conferees and all but two of the House conferees, those two being out of town. The items in disagreement were with respect to increased funds for operations and transportation.

The members of the Senate committee felt that the testimony presented to us in regard to the estimated volume of mail for the next fiscal year clearly indicated the necessity for the budget estimates; and the bill as passed by the Senate provided for the budget estimates, which were $10,880,000 more than the House had allowed for operations, and $10 million more than the House had allowed for transportation.

In conference, several proposals were made, back and forth. Finally we compromised by splitting the difference—50–50. So the conference report provides for operations $5,440,000 more than was carried in the bill as passed by the House, and an equal amount less than was carried in the bill as passed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 3, for transportation, the conference report provides $5 million more than was included in the bill as passed by the House and $5 million less than was included in the bill as passed by the Senate.

We think the House was a little tight on the Post Office Department. The Department may have to have a supplemental estimate next year, to keep the mails moving. But most legislative matters involve compromise; and in that spirit we have submitted the conference report, and request its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to concur in what the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] has said. The conference report represents a meeting of the minds of the conferees, and is a compromise. But it seems to us to be a very thorough one.

I concur in the request of the Senator from Virginia that the conference report be adopted.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the chairman of the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations wishes to acknowledge with thanks the fine assistance given him by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], both in the hearings and in marking up the bill and in conference.

We upheld the Senate's position until we decided that it would be better to make a compromise and get a report, and have a bill enacted into law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the very able junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the very able senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for their promptness in handling this bill. Last year we thought they set a record when they made it possible for us to pass the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill on May 23, and for the President to sign the bill on June 1. But now we find they have moved the schedule up to March. I am not sure that they are entirely responsible for the speed and the thorough action; I rather suspect that the able senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has been expediting the work of the committee. In any event, regardless of who may be responsible, the leadership on both sides of the aisle are very grateful, I am sure, for the very prompt, very thorough, and very efficient way in which this first appropriation bill has been handled.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I acknowledge with grateful appreciation the nice tribute paid by the majority leader.

Let me say that if the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the chairman of the subcommittee could control debate on the floor of the Senate as well as we have been able to do in our committee, the Senate would end its session by the middle of June. [Laughter.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am sure the minority wish to join with the majority leadership in expressing appreciation not only to the distinguished chairman of the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], but also to the ranking members on both the minority and majority sides of the committee, and particularly to the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the very able chairman of the full Appropriations Committee, who, I am sure, has had the cooperation of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the ranking minority member, and all other members of the committee in expediting the taking of action on the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. President, as has already been indicated, we could not have accomplished this without the full cooperation of the minority members of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, sometimes visitors to the Capitol see legislative measures passed by the Senate with a minimum of controversy, and do not understand how a bill can be passed without having a knockdown and dragout fight. Let me say that one of the secrets in that connection was revealed to me only yesterday by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I had not been assigned to his committee for more than minutes—literally minutes—under the order of the Senate, entered a few days ago, assigning me to membership on that committee, before the Senator from Arizona came to me and gave me a list of the subcommittees and their membership, and suggested that I take the list home with me and study it, and become acquainted with the organization of the committee. I did so.

Then, on yesterday, I had no more than entered the committee room when the Senator from Arizona came to me, and called a clerk to join us, and said to me, "Here is a list of the schedule of subcommittee meetings, and here is one that I want you to begin hearings with."

I asked, "When?"

He replied, "May 7."

I asked the Senator from Arizona, "Are you not planning a little far ahead? Usually Senator KNOWLAND and I plan the work for the Senate Chamber only 2 or 3 days ahead."

The Senator from Arizona replied, "Well, that is the schedule; and you are to start the hearing on May 7."

So I want to pay a great tribute to this distinguished son of Arizona, who has done so much to contribute to the efficiency of the work of the Senate. I wish to say that I very greatly appreciate all of his extremely fine work.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I thank all the Senators—and particularly for not calling me a slave driver. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the majority leader did not quite tell the whole story. The hearings may start on May 7; but the rest of the story is that when the chairman of the Appropriations Committee says hearings will begin at 10 o'clock, they begin at 10 o'clock. I think a person could deliver a rather pointed lecture on punctuality to the United States Senate and to a great many members of the committees. Frankly, time after time three-quarters of an hour or half an hour is wasted at the beginning of a committee session. If a committee is to meet at 10 o'clock it often takes until 11 o'clock to obtain a quorum; and, of course, in the meantime the members who are present cannot pursue their usual duties.

I wish to say, to the everlasting credit of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] that at 10 o'clock a. m., when the hearings begin, he is there, and the hearings get under way then, regardless of whether any other member is present at that time.

Mr. President, once we hew to that line, we shall accomplish a great deal more in handling the business of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate the admonition of the Senator from Illinois; and I am sure that in connection with matters in which the majority leader is interested, he will be present promptly at 10 o'clock.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I have been listening most intently, in anticipation that some Senator would move that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be made a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. [Laughter.]

REGULATION OF USE BY MOTOR CARRIERS OF CERTAIN MOTOR VEHICLES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 898) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the use by motor carriers (under leases, contracts, or other arrangements) of motor vehicles not owned by them, in the furnishing of transportation of property.

Mr. MAGNUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Well, Mr. President, I am willing to yield again. Of course, some time ago I had the floor; and since then the Senate has passed approximately six bills or other measures. I am willing to yield, to have the Senate pass six more, if that is desired.

Mr. SMATHERS. Not only has the Senate done what the Senator has mentioned, Mr. President, but the Senate has appropriated almost $100 million, by means of the conference report on the appropriation bill which was acted upon a few minutes ago.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. What is a public carrier?

Mr. MAGNUSON. A public carrier is an authorized carrier, which includes both common and contract carriers operating in interstate commerce.

Mr. FREAR. What is a private carrier?

Mr. MAGNUSON. A private carrier is one carrying its own goods, and is not subject to economic regulation, and need not file rates.

Let me inquire whether we are indulging in quizzes.

Mr. FREAR. I merely wish to ask some questions, and to obtain answers to them.

What is 203 (b) (6) to which the Senator from Washington refers in his amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. 203 (b) (6) is part of the Interstate Commerce Act which interprets the term agricultural commodities; in other words, it states what they are.

Mr. FREAR. Yes. Does a private carrier pay the transportation tax?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; a private carrier would pay the transportation tax in the States in which such carrier operates.

Mr. FREAR. I mean the transportation tax levied by the Government on the transportation of property and the transportation of people. It is not a sales tax; it is a transportation tax.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know the carriers pay the sales tax in the various States. Perhaps the Senator from Florida can enlarge upon that point.

Mr. SMATHERS. Today, a private carrier is, of course, one which carries products or property it owns; and the only tax it is required to pay is the regular State tax, provided for by the State regulatory body.

Mr. FREAR. What is that?

Mr. SMATHERS. It differs from State to State.

Mr. FREAR. That is the license for the vehicle.

Mr. SMATHERS. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is all he pays.

Mr. FREAR. What is the rate of transportation tax on a public carrier?

Mr. SMATHERS. I can tell the Senator from Delaware that a certificated carrier must pay 3 percent of the amount paid for transportation.

Mr. FREAR. I think that is entirely correct. The private carrier does not have to pay that 3 percent.

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. What would be the volume of tax paid into the Federal Treasury if all private carriers were assessed a 3 percent tax, which public carriers must pay?

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not know, but it would be considerably more. There are 4 million private carriers, as the Senator from Washington has just pointed out.

Mr. FREAR. Then by the terms of this bill, and by section 203 (b) (6) of the Interstate Commerce Act, are we not giving a tax exempt privilege to a private carrier, while we are assessing public carriers?

Mr. SMATHERS. No, we are not. A private carrier is not presumed to be in the business of common carriage. He is supposed to be carrying only his own goods. What the Senator is saying is that if we do not amend the bill as the Senator from Washington has suggested, in many respects we shall be permitting a private carrier, in effect, to operate as a common carrier, and to that extent, probably, avoid paying the 3 percent tax.

Mr. FREAR. Is it not true that many people who have been shipping by public carrier have installed their own systems of transportation, to avoid the 3 percent transportation tax?

Mr. SMATHERS. We are leaving out one very important step. For example, when the private carrier carries his own monkey wrenches from Chicago to Delaware, in order to trip lease his truck back home, he must go to a certificated carrier and enter into a lease with such carrier. The certificated carrier pays all the taxes necessary, in order to bring that truck through.

Mr. FREAR. Is the Senator sure about that?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am sure.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is the law today, and the bill does not change it.

Mr. FREAR. I am sure that both the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Washington are familiar with some of the large private carriers of this country. They went into business to haul their own products, and they are hauling their own products; but if they were not in that business, and had to use public transportation, they would be paying a 3 percent tax into the Federal Treasury, would they not?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. Then are we not widening the field of exemption by continuing to increase the number of private transporters?

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are leaving it as it is.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let me put it this way: For example, Sears, Roebuck & Co. is a private carrier, carrying only those things which it manufactures or sells. When it takes its trucks from Washington, D. C., to Chicago and unloads them at its store, if it wishes to bring any truck back loaded, it must either buy something and take title to it, in which event it could bring it back without paying the common carrier tax; or if it wished to bring back something else, it would have to go to a certificated carrier and say, "Here is our truck, and here is our driver. We will lease this truck to you under your certificate." Perhaps, in that case, the truck would bring back monkey wrenches. In such a case the certificated carrier would pay the tax.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then, of course, he would come under the same regulation as a common carrier.

Mr. FREAR. In such a case would he then operate under authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Certainly, because he leases to a common carrier.

Mr. FREAR. Then he would be subject to the rates imposed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and also subject to the transportation tax.

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. Let us carry the illustration a little further. Suppose the same truck which the Senator has used in his illustration went to Chicago, and then went outside Chicago 20 miles and picked up a truckload of pumpkins from the farmer or producer, and brought them back to Washington.

Mr. SMATHERS. He can always carry agricultural products without being subject to ICC regulation. Pumpkins in the raw state are obviously agricultural products, so he does not need any certificate from the ICC to carry them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Or a pumpkin pie, under my amendment.

Mr. SMATHERS. Or a pumpkin pie, if it is perishable.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is perishable.

Mr. SMATHERS. I presume a pumpkin pie would be considered perishable.

Mr. FREAR. Anything of a canned nature which is perishable could also be included in that category; could it not?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct under the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. FREAR. The bill as it stands, without the amendment of the Senator from Washington, does not include that feature; does it?

Mr. SMATHERS. The way the bill is now written, before consideration of the amendment of the Senator from Washington, it provides that all private carriers may trip lease by one or a series of leases in the general direction of home base. To do that would, in many respects, as the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Delaware have pointed out, authorize certain private carriers to trip lease who have nothing whatsoever to do with agriculture, and never intend to have anything to do with agriculture; in effect to go into the trucking business, because they could trip lease to whomever they wished, and wherever they wished, as long as the movement is in the general direction of home, without being subject to ICC regulation.

Mr. FREAR. As private carriers?

Mr. SMATHERS. As private carriers.

Mr. FREAR. Without paying the transportation tax?

Mr. SMATHERS. They themselves would not pay the transportation tax, but I will say to the Senator from Delaware that when they trip lease, the man

to whom they lease must pay the transportation tax.

Mr. FREAR. Under all circumstances?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct; under all conditions.

Mr. FREAR. I noticed that the Senator from Washington was very explicit in his enumeration of the products covered by his amendment. He mentioned fish. I should like to inquire if oysters are included in that category.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. Canned or fresh?

Mr. MAGNUSON. They would have to be fresh, or perishable.

Mr. FREAR. How about canned oysters?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Canned oysters would not be considered perishable. Canned goods are not touched by this amendment at all. The right to haul canned goods by private carrier or authorized carrier remains as it is. A private carrier may still trip lease, if it is for longer than a 30-day period, after transporting canned goods, in any amount.

Mr. FREAR. What advantage is the Senator's amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The advantage of my amendment is that a private carrier must haul agricultural products or processed agricultural perishable products, in order to trip lease back. My amendment would affect the so-called itinerant truckers who run around the country. If they are to run around the country under an agricultural exemption, I say to them, "Sometime during your trip you had better haul some agricultural products." I think that would help the farmer.

Mr. FREAR. In effect, the Senator's amendment would give greater discretion, or greater control to the Interstate Commerce Commission than would the bill as it stands.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. I think we are not proposing to give the Interstate Commerce Commission more control.

Mr. FREAR. But the Senator is proposing to place more vehicles under its control.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. What we are doing in one respect, definitely, is defining the exemption given to the haulers of agricultural products, which has been a source of confusion in many cases before the Interstate Commerce Commission. There has not, in many instances, been a clear-cut definition of the term "agricultural products." We are defining that exemption once and for all. It will include, as far as private carriers are concerned, perishable processed agricultural products.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one observation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let me say to the Senator from Delaware that there are 4 million private carriers. What the Senator from Washington is saying is, "We will not permit all those 4 million private carriers to trip lease. If they are going to be in that business, they should become common carriers and obtain certificates."

Out in the Midwest, butter and other processed products are no longer considered agricultural products. When meat has been cut up and the skin has been taken off it, and the carcass has been disjointed, the resulting product is no longer considered a straight agricultural product. Milk which has been pasteurized is no longer considered an agricultural product. Under those conditions, wholesalers and those engaged in the business of regularly carrying that type of processed agricultural product to the market in Chicago, Indianapolis, or elsewhere would be able, under the amendment of the Senator from Washington, to trip lease in order to get home, so that the cost of carrying the product to market would not be unduly increased. Unless they are regular carriers of processed or manufactured agricultural commodities, perishable in nature, they will not have the privilege of trip leasing.

Mr. FREAR. Under the present law, as I understand, they do not have the privilege of trip leasing, but must return empty. Is that correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. The practice of trip leasing has been permitted to everybody on everything. During the war when there was a shortage of trucks, and to meet the transportation problem, the ICC permitted the practice to grow. The war is over. The common carriers come in and say, "We must get a certificate from you in Washington and spend weeks and a great deal of money in order to get it. Then you finally give us a certificate under which we are authorized to carry one product." For example, they could be certificated to carry nothing but monkey wrenches. After they get that certificate they say, "Why do you allow a private carrier, like Sears, Roebuck, to transport the one thing that you let us carry?"

The ICC, under its order, would stop all of it. That order would affect the farmers, as well. The farmers rose up in righteous indignation and said to us that you have to meet that farm problem. We thereupon began to work in trying to solve the whole problem. I might say that the ICC said to us, "If you people want to set a policy, we would like to have you go ahead and do it. Otherwise, we will have to stop all this trip leasing."

That is what we are trying to do. We are trying to keep the ICC from eliminating trip leasing, so far as farmers are concerned, so far as farm cooperatives are concerned, and so far as businesses which regularly carry agricultural commodities are concerned.

Then with the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], we are also going to permit trip leasing by a private carrier when the private carrier is regularly employed in carrying perishable processed or manufactured agricultural commodities. We are therefore setting up specific rules applicable to private carriers with respect to trip leasing.

Mr. FREAR. According to the statement just made by the Senator from Florida, if the bill were not enacted, the ICC would not permit any trip leasing, including the trip leasing of trucks carrying agricultural commodities. Is that correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. The ICC issued an order about 5 years ago that would not permit anyone to trip lease because the regulation required that leases of trucks must be for a period of 30 days or longer. That was an effective way of eliminating trip leasing, because no farm group wanted to trip lease its truck for 30 days or longer. They want to have that truck return home immediately.

The Senator from Washington, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and other Senators have been discussing the trip-lease regulations with the ICC. At our request the ICC has held up its order, MC–43, until Congress could set some guideposts and establish a policy on the subject.

Mr. FREAR. Is that the situation at the present time?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FREAR. The bill proposes to give definitions as to what is permissible under the trip-leasing practice. Is that correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. We would say who can do it and who cannot do it.

Mr. FREAR. According to the Senator from Washington, he is improvising on the bill by adding an amendment which will permit trip leasing on perishable canned products if it is the regular commodity carried by that truck. Is that correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. Yes. Under his amendment a truck could trip lease on the return trip. It would be able to carry anything it wants to carry as long as it was leased to an authorized carrier.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And if it goes in the general direction of the home base.

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Senator for giving me a better understanding of the bill. I do wish to say to the Senator from Florida, who is also a member of the Committee on Finance that he is cognizant of the fact, I am sure, that there is a shortage in the till of the Federal Treasury, and that we would not help to reduce that shortage by permitting private carriers to escape the payment of the 3 percent transportation tax.

Mr. SMATHERS. I may say to the Senator from Delaware that the proposal of the Senator from Washington would probably do a great deal to make a private carrier either lease his truck legitimately to a certificated carrier or to move his goods himself. The result would be that there probably would be more tax money coming into the Treasury.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have had a considerable amount of correspondence addressed to me by various organizations, individuals, and groups in my State on S. 898. I have also received correspondence from groups outside my State.

I wish to commend the Senator from Florida and the other members of the committee for the very clear record they have made today in support of S. 898. It is very interesting that the only correspondence I have had on the subject is

in favor of the bill, and that no correspondence has come to me in opposition to the bill. I have studied the correspondence and the committee report and the various briefs that have been filed in connection with S. 898, and I have come to the conclusion that it is legislation which is in the public interest. Therefore I shall vote for it this afternoon, including the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

I ask unanimous consent to have published at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the correspondence that I have received on the subject, on the basis of which and the committee report I have formed my final conclusion to support the legislation.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLUE LAKE PACKERS, INC.,
Salem, Oreg., March 5, 1956.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is our understanding that the trip-leasing bill S. 898, is scheduled to come before the Senate in the near future for debate and action. We urge your support of this bill in the form in which it has been reported to the Senate by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, without further restrictive amendment, for we sincerely believe that it preserves the economical and efficient practice of long-standing of leasing trucks for return hauls for it further preserves the importance from the standpoint of agriculture for the right of private carriers to trip lease.

In these days of increasingly keen competition and the price squeeze on the products of the farm, the maintenance and utilization of every possible economy is increasingly necessary.

Thanks in advance for your support of this bill which we sincerely feel is necessary to the agricultural economy of the State of Oregon.

Very truly yours,

N. W. MERRILL,
Executive Vice President and General Manager.

THE OREGON WHEAT GROWERS LEAGUE,
Pendleton, Oreg., March 8, 1956.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Interstate Commerce Commission has taken action in the past to discontinue the short-term leasing of independently owned trucks. Trip leasing, as you are well aware, is necessary for the agricultural exemption clause of the Interstate Commerce Act to have any meaning.

In the last session of Congress, H. R. 3203 was passed by the House of Representatives to prevent the ICC from nullifying trip leasing. A bill was introduced into the Senate, S. 898, to accomplish the same purpose as the House bill but did not reach the Senate floor prior to adjournment. Unless this bill is passed during the current session, the ICC has ruled that trip leasing of trucks by private carriers must cease on June 1, 1956.

The major purpose of the bill is to terminate the authority of the Commission to prohibit trip leasing or short-term leases of trucks. Trip leasing is the long-established practice whereby a hauler of farm products, having reached market, obtains a return haul by leasing his truck and his services to a common carrier.

Continuation of this practice is essential to efficient marketing and economical transportation of farm products. Unless trucks hauling farm products are permitted to obtain revenue on the return haul by trip leasing they must either (1) increase transportation rates for hauling farm products, or (2) go out of business because they cannot survive the competition of carriers that are permitted to obtain two-way revenue.

The existence of the independent truck operator, who can move from any farm shipping area to any market without back-hauling and transfer of lading, and who can be mobilized from surrounding areas to move seasonal commodities, is essential if farm products are to be marketed to best advantage.

Unless the right to trip-lease is maintained, the agricultural exemption of the Interstate Commerce Act becomes meaningless.

The enactment of S. 898 is supported by all agricultural interests and organizations.

We request your support for this legislation which is important to all agricultural producers in the State of Oregon.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD K. BAUM,
Executive Secretary.

NORTHWEST NUT GROWERS,
Portland, Oreg., March 8, 1956.

Re trip-leasing bill, S. 898
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WAYNE: For many months we have been observing the progress and the pro and con arguments which have taken place in the Senate concerning the above-captioned bill. I know you are fully aware of the contents of this legislation, also the reasons for it. So there is no particular use for me to go over those things again.

Basically, of course, this bill is designed to preserve the efficient and economical practice of leasing trucks for return hauls. Since there are great numbers of private carrier trucks which transport agricultural products in processed form, it is most important from the standpoint of agriculture that the right of private carriers to trip-lease shall be preserved.

The form in which this bill has been reported to the Senate by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is the form in which we feel it should be passed without further restrictive amendments.

In light of the situation which is presently engulfing the farmers' economy, I feel this is one way in which Congress can help us partially solve our problems. The high cost of freight is ever becoming more serious. High freight cost from the Pacific Northwest to eastern markets is even more of a consideration than it is in some other parts of the country. There is scarcely any need to observe that the recently granted 6-percent increase to railroads by ICC was anything but welcome news to the farmers.

With these increases granted to the railroads, the truck people will be fully justified in asking for a similar adjustment and, of course, they will get it.

Thank you for your good attention.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. TRUNK,
General Manager.

YAKIMA, WASH., *March 12, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Fruit industry urges you vote for S. 898. Continuation of trip-leasing privileges as therein authorized will help provide adequate supply agricultural exempt trucks whose flexibility of route and service enhances distribution our fruits. Without trip leasing we would face serious transportation shortage as outlined in my statement forwarded with my letter of June 13.

ERNEST FALK,
Northwest Horticultural Council.

HOOD RIVER TRAFFIC ASSOCIATION,
Hood River, Oreg., March 13, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are informed that finally the Senate bill 898 is up for vote before the Senate and we trust that you will vote favorably for the passage of this bill as indicated in our previous correspondence. We have advised you of our interest in this bill from time to time and the reasons why we are in favor of this bill. You also have indicated your intention to support our position if and when the bill did finally come to the Senate for a vote.

It is our understanding that the bill as approved by the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is the one that will come to the Senate for a vote and the bill as recommended by the committee is the one that the agricultural interests are in favor of. If, by chance, amendments are added to the bill that changes the intent and purpose of the bill as recommended by the committee, we would want to be informed of such action without delay.

As you realize, this bill has been before the Congress for 3 years and has had difficulty in being passed although the House did take favorable action on it a year ago, and, due to delaying tactics, it never came before the Senate for vote at the last session. However, it was progressed through committee to the point where it could be considered at this session.

Now that it has reached the Senate, we trust that you will continue to support the bill and there will be sufficient support in the Senate to pass the bill.

Yours very truly,

R. G. SCEARCE,
Secretary-Manager.

PENDLETON GRAIN GROWERS, INC.,
Pendleton, Oreg., March 12, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is our understanding that the so-called trip-leasing bill, Senate bill 898, should come before the Senate in the near future for debate and action.

This is an effective way for the farmers of the Nation to obtain some actual competition in transportation of farm products. We very definitely want to see the trip-leasing provision maintained for all types of carriers, particularly private carriers. Therefore, when this bill comes on the Senate floor, we hope that you will support it in the form in which it has been reported to the Senate by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee without any further restrictive amendments being put onto the bill.

We certainly appreciate your interest in those problems which affect the interests of our farm people. Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

JAMES HILL, JR.,
Manager.

OREGON FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Salem, Oreg., February 29, 1956.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Oregon Farm Bureau Federation, for the past several years, has been particularly interested in the continuation of the practice of trip leasing—or the short-term leases of trucks.

Oregon agriculture is particularly concerned about the problem because of the rapid growth of this practice in the last few years—especially as it relates to haulers taking Oregon farm products into the State of California, and then obtaining a return haul by being able to lease the truck to a common carrier.

The farmers of Oregon are depending upon a continuation of this practice in order that orderly marketing functions may be continued and competition be offered in the transportation field.

The independent operators perform a very valuable service to the farmers of Oregon. Many of them live in farming communities, and are willing to fit their operations to the special needs of the farmer. They are willing to load on farms, help load, and to put up with loading inconveniences. They are willing to move from farm to farm so as to most effectively reach all market outlets to the best advantage of the farmer. They are willing and able to provide an individual service on the farms, on the road, or at the marketplace.

We, therefore, view with concern any regulation which would make it more difficult for independent operators to continue this service to agriculture.

The Senate will undoubtedly consider S. 898 (trip-lease bill) which gives the ICC power to regulate the leasing practices of common and contract carriers. The bill also provides that the ICC shall not have the power to regulate the duration of such short-term lease where the motor vehicle has a previous history of hauling agricultural products.

On behalf of the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation we respectfully urge your support of S. 898.

Yours truly,

GEORGE W. DEWEY,
Executive Secretary.

THOMAS C. DYER, INC.,
Spokane, Wash., March 15, 1956.

Re Senate bill 898.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As vice president and manager of Thomas C. Dyer, Inc., I am writing to you asking your support in favor of the pasage of Senate bill 898.

Our only source of revenue is the transportation of farm machinery from the points of manufacture to the farm machinery dealers in Oregon and surrounding States. As you can readily understand, our volume of traffic fluctuates greatly at different times of the year. It is not economical for us, a reasonably small operation, to own equipment to be able to meet these peak demands of the season for the service. It is essential that we lease trucks and trailers from both private individuals and other trucklines. Many times this leased equipment is available and/or needed for only one trip, particularly during emergencies.

The Interstate Commerce Commission proposes two leasing rules which would prevent the lease of equipment for a period of less than 30 days and would also prevent a payment of rental based upon the revenue derived from the use of the equipment. Both of these leasing rules would make it impossible for the haulers of farm machinery to operate on a sound, economic basis. Most of the drivers for Thomas C. Dyer, Inc., own their own equipment. Under present conditions it is possible for them to use their equipment for other purposes when it is not needed by this firm. The extreme peaks and valleys of the volume of traffic make imperative the lease of the equipment for whatever period is necessary and payment of rental based upon the revenue derived from the use of the equipment.

Senate bill 898 would curb the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe the length of the lease period and determine the manner of rental compensation.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has exempted carriers of automobiles from the subject of these rules, but has refused to give the farm machinery haulers the same consideration. There is absolutely no difference in the mode of operation and the need for exemption between the automobile carriers and the farm machinery carriers.

The carriers of farm machinery sincerely feel that they are being discriminated against, and for that reason they urgently desire the passage of Senate bill 898.

Yours very truly,

DAVID C. COOK.

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., March 21, 1956.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are informed that the trip-leasing bill (S. 898) will be on the Senate floor for vote in the next few days. We urge you to vote for the bill as it was voted out by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. We urge you to oppose any amendment to further restrict the practice of trip leasing such as to prohibit private truckers from trip leasing.

Trip leasing promotes efficiency and good service in trucking. This practice, therefore, is of vital concern to farmers. It permits the agricultural truckers and other truckers to get a return load by leasing the equipment and driver to common and contract carriers, instead of returning empty. We do not ask that exempt agricultural truckers and private truckers be allowed to secure a return load on their own account by direct negotiation with shippers, but we do request that they be permitted to continue the time-honored practice of leasing truck and driver to common and contract carriers for a load under the authorized carriers' schedule of rates and safety requirements.

In many cases it is more economical for common and contract carriers to trip lease a truck than to send their own truck. They, themselves, might not have a return load. At times, the common or contract carriers do not have enough equipment of their own, and, therefore, without the privilege of trip leasing they would not be able to meet all the transportation demands, or they would have to maintain an idle reserve of equipment in order to take care of peak periods. The trip-leasing practice, in effect, provides a fluid or mobile reserve of trucks and drivers to meet peak and unusual demands.

Since the day the Interstate Commerce Commission issued the order banning trip leasing the Commission has made many changes or exceptions in it. However, the amended order still prohibits private truckers, such as those firms processing agricultural products and operating their own fleet, from trip leasing their trucks to common and contract carriers to get a return load. For example: a meat packer in Chicago who sends his own meat products to Florida in his own refrigerated truck would, under the pending ICC trip-leasing order, be prohibited from trip leasing it to a common or contract carrier for a return load of frozen citrus concentrates. We in agriculture are concerned with the transportation charges all the way between farmers and consumers and not only between farmers and the nearest rail or truck shipping point. Senate bill 898, if passed, would preserve the time-honored practice of trip leasing.

The safety argument against trip leasing is largely irrelevant. In the first place, a common or contract carrier that leases a truck is as responsible for compliance with safety rules on this truck as he is on his own trucks. Secondly, the States have the primary responsibility for enforcement of safety. In the third place, there is evidence to indicate that trip-leased trucks are as safe as employee-operated, company-owned equipment, or even safer. That is why the examiner in the further hearing on trip leasing concluded that the record afforded no definite answer on the question of safety.

Again, we urge you to vote for Senate bill 898 without crippling amendments.

Respectfully yours,

LLOYD C. HALVORSON,
Economist.

NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We respectfully and earnestly ask that you vote for the trip-leasing bill, Senate bill 898. Your support of the proposed legislation is urgently needed to assure farmers that in the transportation of agricultural commodities to market by truck facilities will be available at all times at reasonable costs. The long-established practice of trip leasing has made possible efficient marketing and economical transportation of farm products. It must be continued.

This week the Senate passed the farm bill. Honorable and sincere men differ on the benefits to agriculture to be obtained from its various provisions. The farm organizations have opposing positions. However, there is no disagreement whatever among the national agricultural groups regarding the benefits agriculture will derive from the provisions of Senate bill 898.

The National Milk Producers Federation has supported and continues its support of the proposed legislation.

Your favorable vote for Senate bill 898 as reported by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will be very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

E. M. NORTON,
Secretary.

VEGETABLE GROWERS
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
March 20, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: As the representative of the Vegetable Growers Association of America, the only national organization of vegetable growers, who depend heavily upon truck transportation and particularly trip-leased vehicles, I strongly urge your support of Senate bill 898 as favorably reported by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

The association adopted the following resolution at its 47th annual convention held here in Washington, December 1955:

"We urge the Congress to clarify its intent to the ICC to maintain previously granted highway exemptions of agricultural commodities."

This association is widely known for its policy of refusing the use of Government subsidies, which are a direct cost to the taxpayer. This policy reflects the traditional American right, the opportunity to produce and market their commodity as the law of supply and demand dictates. Therefore, this association believes it is not unreasonable to request your support of S. 898, which will not handicap their efforts or further reduce their already depressed income.

To deny the long-standing and satisfactory practice of trip leasing will only add to the cost of vegetables to consumers and reduce the return to the vegetable grower. It will

deny the consumer of fresh produce in many instances because of a lack of facilities to handle rapidly perishable vegetables. To firmly establish the practice of trip leasing will be an outstanding and appreciated contribution by the Congress to American agriculture and particularly the Nation's vegetable growers.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH S. SHELLY,
Secretary.

INTERNATIONAL APPLE ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Washington, D. C., March 12, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: There is at present pending before your honorable body for consideration S. 898 which would, in effect, permit continuation of the long-established practice of trip-leasing trucks by restraining the Interstate Commerce Commission from regulating the duration of such leases.

The members of International Apple Association are vitally concerned in this matter, and urge your favorable consideration of this legislation when it is brought to a vote. This association has actively advocated passage of similar legislation when it was brought up in previous sessions of Congress, and has opposed the Interstate Commerce Commission's endeavors to impose a minimum lease of 30 days by regulations issued under MC–43, lease and interchange of motor vehicles.

While these regulations as presently proposed to be put into effect by Interstate Commerce Commission are purported to take care of trip leasing by exempt agricultural haulers, it is the belief of IAA members that only by legislative action can this be assured since the Commission has issued more than 75 orders in connection with these regulations since they were first issued on May 8, 1951. There is no reason to presume that they will not be further amended, especially if the threat of imminent legislative action is removed.

This is a very real problem in many producing areas, and one not to be shrugged off lightly. I earnestly urge your consideration of this matter and your favorable action on this bill, S. 898.

Sincerely yours,

FRED W. BURROWS,
Executive Vice President.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In the next few days the Senate will consider S. 898, the trip-lease bill, by Senators SMATHERS and MONRONEY.

The American Farm Bureau Federation respectfully recommends your support of this measure in the form reported by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Its enactment is, in our opinion, essential to continued efficient marketing and economical transportation of farm products.

We are enclosing a copy of a statement in which we have endeavored to state concisely the purpose of the bill.

Very sincerely,

CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
President.

S. 898, THE TRIP-LEASE BILL

This bill would provide specific statutory authority to the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the truck leasing practices of contract and common carriers by motor vehicles; but would provide that the Commission shall not have authority to regulate the duration of any such lease where the motor vehicle leased is one previously used for the hauling of farm products.

The major purpose of the bill is to terminate the authority of the Commission to prohibit trip leasing or short-term leases of trucks. Trip leasing is the long established practice whereby a hauler of farm products, having reached market, obtains a return haul by leasing his truck and his services to a common carrier.

Continuation of this practice is essential to efficient marketing and economical transportation of farm products. Unless trucks hauling farm products are permitted to obtain revenue on the return haul by trip leasing they must either (1) increase transportation rates for hauling farm products, or (2) go out of business because they cannot survive the competition of carriers that are permitted to obtain two-way revenue.

The existence of the independent truck operator, who can move from any farm shipping area to any market without back-hauling and transfer of lading, and who can be mobilized from surrounding areas to move seasonal commodities, is essential if farm products are to be marketed to best advantage.

Unless the right to trip lease is maintained, the agricultural exemption of the Interstate Commerce Act becomes meaningless.

The enactment of S. 898 is supported by all agricultural interests and organizations.

HISTORY OF ISSUE

On May 8, 1951, ICC issued a ruling, MC–43, which provided that all truck leases must be for a period of at least 30 days—thus effectively terminating the practice of trip leasing.

A bill, H. R. 3203, was introduced in the 83d Congress, to prevent the Commission from taking such action. This bill was passed by an overwhelming voice vote in the House, but did not reach the Senate floor prior to adjournment.

During the process of congressional hearings of H. R. 3203 and S. 898, the Interstate Commerce Commission amended MC–43 on numerous occasions and in numerous respects. In its present amended form MC–43 contains much, but by no means all, of the provisions of S. 898. Many of the provisions of the amended MC–43 have been in effect for some time. Certain provisions thereof, including a prohibition against trip leasing of their trucks by private carriers, become effective June 1, 1956.

It is our conviction that the amendments to MC–43 that were made during congressional consideration of the bill, were the result of the legislative situation, were designed to head off legislation, and do not represent any change of viewpoint by the Commission.

Unless S. 898 is approved, the Commission will be free to re-amend its regulations in the future, to prohibit trip leasing. In view of the long history of ICC opposition to the agricultural exemption, and the Commission's expressed views with respect to the practice of trip leasing it is believed this would be the eventual outcome.

Trip leasing is of major significance to the efficient operation of truck common carriers—many of whom have supported the enactment of S. 898. Few companies can afford to own equipment adequate to handle peak loads and seasonal movements. It is uneconomic to maintain idle equipment for such contingencies. Even when a company is well supplied with equipment, it may not have equipment of the right kind, at the right place, at the right time, to meet all its needs. In order to efficiently service all their customers, common carirers must be able to dip into the transportation pool represented by exempt haulers to meet such needs.

From time to time the Congress appropriately concerns itself with the problem of maintaining small business as a healthy and dynamic part of our economy. With the exception of farmers and retail businesses there is no segment of our economy with a larger number of small businesses than the trucking industry. Curtailment of the practice of trip leasing would disastrously affect the welfare, and in many cases the continued existence, of these small businesses.

The enactment of S. 898 does not involve any change in the status of regulation of trucks as such regulations exist at this time. On the contrary, it would insure the maintenance of the status quo.

UNITED FRESH FRUIT AND VEGETABLE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: S. 898 is an important agricultural bill. We understand it is to be taken up for consideration in the Senate following passage of the farm bill. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has reported favorably on S. 898.

The Interstate Commerce Commission issued an order, originally effective March 1 but postponed until July 1, which, in effect, would prevent haulers of agricultural products from leasing their trucks for return loads of nonagricultural freight. The order of the Commission, however, would permit such leasing for not less than 30 days, with certain ambiguous and complicated requirements. For all practical purposes, the net effect of the order would prohibit trip leasing, and substantially nullify the agricultural exemption in the Interstate Commerce Act which has been sustained and extended by the Congress on several occasions.

S. 898 would prohibit such regulation by the Commission except as to safety. A similar bill was passed in the House on June 24, 1953, and we have every reason to believe S. 898 would be approved promptly by the House.

S. 898 has been endorsed by the four national farm organizations, and numerous organizations interested in the marketing of agricultural and fishery products. It is very important to the marketing of highly perishable fresh fruits and vegetables.

We respectfully urge your favorable consideration of S. 898.

Sincerely,

C. W. KITCHEN,
Executive Vice President.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1956.

Re S. 898 (trip-leasing bill).

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I respectfully urge your support of S. 898, referred to as the trip-leasing bill, in the form in which it has been reported to the Senate by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The bill has been cleared by the majority policy committee to be taken up in the Senate following consideration of the resolution proposing a constitutional amendment relating to election of the President and the Vice President.

In the 3 years that this bill and similar legislation have been the subject of hearings and consideration by the Senate at the committee level, many irrelevant questions have been introduced by the opposition to confuse and distract attention from the main issue involved and the real purpose of the legislation.

The heart of the bill is that provision which would preserve the right by statute

of farmers, cooperative associations of farmers, private carriers, and other agricultural haulers to lease their trucks to authorized motor carriers for backhauls and for other short periods of time, rather than having to return empty in the direction of the areas where their trucks are usually based. The legislation was made necessary by the proposed imposition by the Interstate Commerce Commission of a 30-day minimum limitation on the length of time for which a truck might be leased and by the continuing threat that, unless a clear policy is established by statute, the Interstate Commerce Commission might at will reinstate such limitation, or an even more stringent one, as applied to trucks hauling agricultural commodities.

The leasing of trucks for return hauls or for short periods at the peak of harvest seasons not only promotes economy in the transportation charges for the movement of agricultural commodities from the farm to the consumer, but also results in efficient and full utilization of equipment and balanced operations for both the lessor and lessee motor carriers.

At a time when the main groups opposing this legislation are enjoying unprecedented prosperity, it is almost beyond belief that they—the management and some labor groups in the railroad and regulated trucking industry—would seek the elimination or curtailment of the trip-leasing practice that has proved its economic value to both producer and consumer in the more economical, efficient, and timely marketing of food products and other agricultural commodities through the years.

The bill would not effect any changes in present trip-leasing practices. It would only make certain by law that in the future the Interstate Commerce Commission shall not put into effect any regulation such as it has proposed which would further restrict the leasing of trucks than as provided in the bill.

In view of the current efforts of the Congress to help stabilize and improve the alarmingly low net income position of agriculture, we feel it is imperative that this bill be enacted promptly to preserve at least some measure of competitive economy in the transportation of agricultural commodities to offset partially the continuing climb in railroad and other regulated carrier rates.

Powerful forces, including the Interstate Commerce Commission, have been alined against a united agriculture on this issue and have succeeded in delaying final congressional action for 3 years. We earnestly urge you to weigh carefully the facts pertinent to the issue and I am confident that you will conclude that S. 898 is not only necessary from the standpoint of agriculture but is fully justified on the basis of the proper interests of all segments of our economy.

Sincerely yours,

HOMER L. BRINKLEY,
Executive Vice President.

P. S.—Because of the paramount interest of our members throughout the country in this matter, as evidenced by several resolutions adopted by our delegate body, I have had our staff prepare a rather complete factual information concerning the issues involved in S. 898, trip-leasing bill. I am enclosing a copy with the thought that this more complete information, fully documented, may be of some value to you and your staff in anticipation of the early consideration of and action on the measure by the Senate.

FACTUAL INFORMATION CONCERNING THE ISSUES INVOLVED IN S. 898, TRIP-LEASING BILL

This bill as reported to the Senate by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on July 30, 1955, vests the Interstate Commerce Commission with specific affirmative authority to regulate the leasing of trucks by common and contract motor carriers, including the requirement that all leases must be in writing, but denies to the Commission authority to limit the length of time for which a truck may be leased from a farmer, a cooperative association, a private carrier, or anyone else following a movement of agricultural commodities in the truck.

The bill has as its primary purpose the preservation of the long-standing economical and efficient practice of trip-leasing whereby farmers, cooperative associations, private carriers, or other owner-operators of for-hire trucks engaged in hauling farm products, after a trip to market have leased their trucks, with drivers, to authorized carriers for a loaded movement back to home base or in the general direction of the area where the truck was based.

BACKGROUND TO THE BILL

The Interstate Commerce Commission on May 8, 1951, issued rules in Ex Parte No. MC–43 to govern the lease and interchange of vehicles by motor carriers. One of these rules prohibited the lease of any truck, with driver, for a period of less than 30 days. Such rule would have had the effect of completely outlawing the trip-leasing of trucks.

The matter was litigated to the Supreme Court of the United States which in a divided opinion on January 12, 1953, held that although there was no specific statutory provision in the Interstate Commerce Act to authorize such restrictive regulation, the Court was of the opinion that under its implied miscellaneous powers the ICC had the authority to issue such rule.

Promptly after the Supreme Court decision there were introduced in both the Senate and the House in the first session of the 83d Congress bills which would establish by statute that although the ICC can regulate leasing practices, it cannot limit the length of time for which a truck might be leased and thus outlaw the leasing of trucks for a single trip.

The House of Representatives overwhelmingly on a voice vote passed such bill on June 24, 1953, after extended public hearings before its Commerce Committee. Hearings were held before a subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in 1953 (July 8 and 9) and before the full Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in 1954 (May 10, 11, June 7, 8, and 25) but the bill was not permitted to come to a vote before the Senate Commerce Committee before the adjournment of the 83d Congress.

Bills were again introduced in both the Senate and House at the beginning of the 84th Congress last year to preserve the trip-leasing practice. Further hearings were again held before the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on June 20, 21, 22, and 23, 1955, and in the closing days of the 1st session of this Congress, the bill was reported in a compromised form to the Senate.

During this long period while the legislation has been under congressional consideration, the ICC has on numerous occasions amended its rules and postponed the effective date of the 30-day rule, as amended. The 30-day rule is now scheduled to go into effect on July 1, 1956.

In view of the fact that the House of Representatives spent considerable time in hearings and approval of the trip-leasing legislation in 1953, only to have the bill die in the Senate Commerce Committee, the House is awaiting action by the Senate at this session before acting on the legislation again. Prompt action by the Senate is important to allow time for hearings and House action before the presently scheduled effective date of the restrictive rule on July 1, 1956.

IMPORTANCE TO AGRICULTURE

Elimination of the leasing of trucks for return hauls would mean that many agricultural haulers would be put out of business, thus denying their services to agriculture, and those that could continue to operate would have to increase their charges on the transportation of agricultural commodities if they had to make the return trips without a pay load.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has recognized the adverse effect that its original 30-day rule would have on agriculture by amending its rule on at least 3 occasions since the legislation has been before Congress to lighten its impact on the marketing of farm products.

The only significant difference between the rule as now proposed by the Commission and the bill before the Senate (S. 898) is that the Commission rule would not permit private carriers to lease their trucks for return hauls to home base. It is tremendously important that this right be preserved so that the trucks of private carriers which transport canned goods, frozen concentrate, meat products, butter and other farm products in a form processed to an extent that the ICC does not regard them as "agricultural commodities," may trip lease their trucks as freely as the operators of trucks which haul the products of agriculture in raw state.

WHY CONGRESS SHOULD ACT

Of the 11 members of the ICC today on the retirement of Commissioner J. Monroe Johnson, there is only 1 member who was on the Commission on May 8, 1951, when the 30-day rule was originally issued (Richard F. Mitchell). Since November 30, 1953, when the ICC made a change, which it termed a permanent amendment of the 30-day rule, to alleviate its adverse impact on agricultural hauling there have been 6 members (including Commissioner Johnson's prospective retirement), more than half, of the Commission to leave by retirement, resignation or expiration of their terms. The two members of the Commission, James K. Knudson and Hugh W. Cross, who were the principal spokesmen for the ICC in opposition to the trip-leasing bill in public hearings before congressional committees in 1953–54–55 are no longer members of the ICC.

The above facts definitely evidence the mutable character of the Commission and show how necessary it is for Congress to establish a definite policy on this matter by statute rather than leaving the policy for determination in accordance with the changing views of a Commission whose membership is continually changing.

PROPONENTS AND OPPONENTS OF THE LEGISLATION

A partial list of those supporting and opposing S. 898, as reflected by the printed hearings before the Senate Surface Transportation Subcommittee last year is as follows:

For

American Farm Bureau Federation.
National Grange.
National Farmers Union.
National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.
National Milk Producers Federation.
United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association.
International Apple Association.
National Fisheries Institute.
Vegetable Growers Association of America.
Growers and Shippers League of Florida.
Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association.
California Grape and Tree Fruit League.
Northwest Horticultural Council.
Dairy Industry Committee.

National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture.
Private Carrier Conference of ATA.
Private Truck Council of America, Inc.
American Association of Nurserymen.
National Live Stock Producers Association.
American National Cattlemen's Association.
National Wool Growers Association.
Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association.
Sun-Maid Raisin Growers of California.
National Potato Council.
Hood River Traffic Association (Oregon).
Dixie Central Produce Co., Inc. (South Carolina).
Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission.
National Grape Cooperative Association, Inc.
Atlanta Freight Bureau.
Atlanta Paper Co.
United States Department of Agriculture.
General Services Administration.
United States Department of Interior.

Against

International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers Union of America.
Association of American Railroads and American Short Line Railroad Association.
Regular Common Carriers Conference of ATA.
Contract Carrier Conference of ATA.
American Federation of Labor.
Associated Transport, Inc.
Washington Motor Transport Association.
Group of Florida Certificated Motor-Transport Carriers.
Helm's New York-Pittsburgh Motor Express, Inc.
Shirks Motor Express (Pennsylvania).
Western States Meat Packers Association Inc.
Interstate Commerce Commission.
United States Department of Commerce.
Assistant Comptroller General of the United States.

COMPARATIVE ECONOMIC CONDITION OF AGRICULTURE AND THE PRINCIPAL GROUPS OPPOSING THIS BILL

Exclusive of the Interstate Commerce Commission, an agency of the Government, the main groups which have sought to eliminate the trip leasing of trucks and which have opposed the trip-leasing bill are the railroads; some, although not all, of the larger common and contract motor carriers; and the teamsters union. The gist of their arguments has been that the leasing of trucks for return hauls or other short periods from agricultural haulers and private carriers has tended to undermine the rate structure and adversely affect the financial health of the regulated transportation industry. Thus, the clear issue presented in this bill is an economic one, an alleged conflict in interest between the above groups on the one hand and the farmer on the other. It should be remembered that through the years since the Motor Carrier Act was passed in 1935 right up to the present time there has not been in effect by statute or regulation any limitation on the length of time for which a truck may be leased or any prohibition against trip leasing.

Let's look at the record of the comparative financial health and progress of these groups opposing the trip-leasing bill compared to agriculture.

CLASS I RAILROADS

The net railway operating income, after Federal income taxes, of the class I railroads of the United States for 1955 was $1,128 million, compared with $874 million for 1954, an increase of 29.1 percent for 1955 over 1954. The net railway operating income for 1955 was the highest for any year in the 11-year period 1945–1955, and represented a 32.4 percent increase over 1945. The net railway operating income, after Federal income taxes, for the past 5 years is as follows:

Year:	*Millions*
1951	$943
1952	1,078
1953	1,109
1954	874
1955	1,128

(Above data from Transport Economics, February 1956, p. 1, monthly publication of the Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics, ICC.)

The large intercity motor carriers of property for the first 9 months of 1955 had net income after income taxes of $57,678,944, compared with $37,040,734 for the comparable period in 1954, an increase of 55.7 percent. Furthermore, this net income after income taxes for the first 9 minths of 1955 for the large intercity motor carriers of property, amounting to $57,678,944 was substantially in excess of the $51,543,832 of net income after income taxes reported by the class I intercity motor carriers for the whole year of 1954 (foregoing data on motor carrier net income from reports Q-800 and Transport Economics, January 1956, published by Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics, ICC). Even with this bright 1955 picture, some motor carriers have already in 1956 put into effect higher rates with the acquiescence of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

TEAMSTERS UNION

The average wage per employee in all trucking and warehousing is believed to be the most accurate available index to how the members of the Teamsters Union are faring in our economy.

The average wage per employee for all trucking and warehousing employees was at the highest figure for the past 11 years in 1954 at $4,884. Although the 1955 figure is not yet available and will not be compiled until later in the year, on the basis of known increases consummated in 1955, it is estimated by those in a position to know, that the average wage for 1955 will probably show as much as a 5 percent increase in 1955 over 1954. The 1954 average wage of $4,884 for trucking and warehousing employees was 30.7 percent higher than the average wage per employee for all private industry in 1954 at $3,734. The uninterrupted climb of wages in the trucking industry, reflecting the financial progress and stability of the regulated trucking industry, is disclosed by the following data on page 17 of American Trucking Trends (1955), an annual publication of the American Trucking Associations, Inc.:

Average wage per employee, all trucking and warehousing 1944–1954

1944	$2,374
1945	2,545
1946	2,752
1947	3,063
1948	3,355
1949	3,545
1950	3,811
1951	4,069
1952	4,377
1953	4,730
1954	4,884

It is also significant to note from American Trucking Trends (1955) at page 16 that in 1953 truck wages were 53 percent of the total truck revenues of the class I intercity common carriers of general freight, the highest percentage in the 10-year period since 1944.

AGRICULTURE

The conditions in agriculture present a striking contrast to the unprecedented prosperity presently enjoyed by the railroad and trucking industries. A few indexes of the contrasting picture will suffice.

The parity ratio which shows the relationship between the index of the prices received by farmers and the prices paid by farmers was in January 1956 at 80, the lowest point for any year since 1939, when it was 77. At 107 in 1951, it has moved downward continuously, as follows:

Parity ratio

1951	107
1952	100
1953	92
1954	89
1955	84
1956 (January)	80

The steady decline in the farmer's share of the consumer's food dollar since 1951, reflecting the increase in handling costs of which transportation charges are a major item in excess of 10 percent, is reflected in the following data from the Agricultural Marketing Service, United States Department of Agriculture:

Farmer's share (percent)

1951	48
1952	47
1953	45
1954	43
1955 (preliminary estimate)	41

The farmer's share of the consumer's retail food dollar was 53 percent in 1945.

The continued decline in the farmer's economic condition since 1951 is also reflected by the following data on income of farm operators from Economic Indicators by Council of Economic Advisers, January 1956, page 7:

[In billions of dollars]

	Realized gross farm income	Net income
1951	37.1	14.8
1952	36.9	14.1
1953	35.2	13.4
1954	34.0	11.8
1955 (3d quarter annual rate)	32.1	10.0

The Economic Report of the President, January 1956 (table D–16, p. 181) reflects that the per capita income from all sources of the farm population for the same years was as follows:

1951	$977
1952	949
1953	918
1954	913
1955	856

The above report of the President, in table D–24, also reflected some very significant wage data, as follows:

Average gross hourly earnings in selected industries, 1955

Manufacturing	$1.88
Bituminous coal mining	2.55
Building construction	2.66
Class I railroads	1.95
Telephone	1.82
Wholesale trade	1.91
Retail trade	1.50
Laundries	1.01
Agriculture	.675

CONCLUSION

Reasonable conclusions to be drawn from the above documented data are that:

1. The leasing of trucks to authorized carriers for return trips or other short periods of time, less than 30 days, which has been practiced through the years and is being practiced at present, has not undermined the rate levels of the regulated carriers nor brought about financial instability to the transportation industry.

2. Agriculture is the No. 1 economic problem of the Nation today and any undue restrictions on the leasing of trucks engaged wholly or in part in marketing agricultural commodities will add to transportation costs

which must largely be borne by farmers and will be reflected in further decreases in their net income. S. 898 is designed to prevent administrative action by the Interstate Commerce Commission with such results to frustrate and partly nullify the other efforts now being made by Congress to stabilize and improve conditions in agriculture.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, so that the RECORD may be complete, I wish to make very brief comment on the pending legislation. Similar legislation, or legislation dealing with the same subject matter, has been before Congress for a number of years.

In the 81st Congress it was my privilege, along with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] to hold hearings on surface transportation.

The problems of the exemption field and the irregular carrier and the exempt carrier and the private carrier and the so-called gypsy carrier came before us in a rather acute form.

From that time to this we have been dealing in committee with that problem and with the need of getting a satisfactory answer to what would be a very serious problem if it were considered wholly from the standpoint of one transportation system.

In the last 30 or 40 years, we have moved from what was essentially a monopoly system of transportation to a system that is highly competitive at the present time. That highly competitive condition has brought about the problems with which we are dealing today. As the result of those problems and because of the effort of the Interstate Commerce Commission to solve them by the issuance of its order, whose suspension has been brought about from time to time, as the Senator from Florida has stated, we are today faced with the necessity of Congress having to define the various areas of truck transportation in this country.

The committee has done an excellent job, and I wish to commend the chairman of the committee and the Senator from Florida, who is the chairman of the subcommittee.

The pending bill is not satisfactory, of course, to any 1 form of transportation or to any 1 segment of our transportation industry. I do not know that it is entirely satisfactory to the agricultural interests.

However, in my judgment, it is the most satisfactory bill we can work out as among the various competitive factors in our transportation system. I believe its enactment will be in the interest of agriculture and in the interest of the transportation system generally, and tend to the orderly development of our transportation system among common carriers, private carriers, farm carriers, and so-called irregular carriers in many of the States of the Union.

I merely wished to add my word of commendation to those of other members of the committee who worked hard on the bill. I hope we may be able to pass it this afternoon and finally provide a definite congressional solution of what has proved to be such a complex problem to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I, too, as a member of the committee, wish to endorse the outstanding work that has been done by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], in connection with this matter, as well as the very constructive approach that was taken by all of my colleagues on the committee. I wish to join in urging support for and passage of the measure.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee the junior Senator from Maine has given thorough study to S. 898, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the use by motor carriers (under leases, contracts, or other arrangements) of motor vehicles not owned by the motor carriers. Although I was not a member of the subcommittee which held hearings on the bill, I carefully reviewed the testimony given at those hearings, and when the bill was before the full committee I voted to report it to the Senate with the recommendation that it be passed.

Despite the fact that the problem of trip-leasing has been before both the 83d Congress and the 84th Congress, and that during both Congresses extensive hearings were held on the subject, there still seems to be considerable confusion as to just what is the purpose of the bill. As a member of the Senate committee which studied the bill, and a Senator from a State that is much concerned with the problem involved, it is my hope that, without going too much into detail, I can resolve the surrounding cloudiness and clearly present the real question. If this can be done I believe there is very little question as to what action the Senate should take on S. 898.

As my distinguished colleagues all know, the trip-leasing problem is one of long standing. It has been under active consideration by the Interstate Commerce Commission for at least 7 years. During this period the Commission has issued regulations covering trip-leasing, established an effective date for the regulation, modified the regulations, and postponed the effective date repeatedly. It is my understanding that the latest Commission action has been to further postpone the effective date until July 1, 1956. The changes and postponements occurred with direct correlation to congressional activity and information developed by Congress on the subject.

At this point it might be well to state in general terms what trip-leasing is. When Congress adopted the Interstate Commerce Act providing for regulation of motor carriers, it partially exempted certain carriers from regulation. Basically these exempt carriers were private carriers and carriers of agricultural commodities, including livestock and fish. These carriers are not exempt from safety requirements regulations. Generally trip-leasing is the practice of the leasing of an exempt carrier by a regulated carrier for a single one-way or round trip. It is obvious that under many different circumstances such an arrangement is desirable to all parties concerned. As a result the practice has been in effect since the enactment of the Interstate Commerce Act. Over the years abuses crept into the system.

It was the abuses that caused the Interstate Commerce Commission to first look into the matter. As a result of its investigation the Commission proposed a regulation which would prohibit trip-leases for less than 30 days duration. The effective result of this regulation would be to abolish trip-leasing altogether. At this point it should be noted that no trip-leasing regulations have ever been put into effect by the Commission.

The heart of the problem as it comes before the Senate today centers on the purpose of Congress in exempting certain motor carriers when it adopted the Interstate Commerce Act. That purpose was to provide a highly flexible system of transportation for agricultural and fishery products to allow rapid and efficient distribution of such products to the markets. The need for having a flexible system of transportation for these products is obvious, and it is equally obvious that that need is as great today as when the act was originally put into effect.

What is the effect of trip-leasing on these exempt carriers and what would be the effect of prohibiting trip-leasing are the real issues at stake. Clearly the transportation of agricultural or fishery products from their point of origin to a market is a one-way operation. By trip-leasing his vehicle to a regulated carrier the operator can haul a payload on his return trip and thus help meet the cost of the trip. Obviously if this arrangement were prohibited so that the carrier had to return home empty it would increase the cost of transportation of agricultural or fishery products and thus would increase the cost to the consumer of such products.

The imposition of a requirement that trip-leases must be for 30 days duration or more would destroy the flexibility of the system that Congress was trying to protect. After this was demonstrated at congressional hearings the Interstate Commerce Commission amended its proposed regulations to exclude agricultural carriers. The proposed regulation would, however, prohibit trip-leasing by private carriers. These private carriers are an essential part of the agricultural transportation system since many producers of such goods do not operate their own vehicles, and the private carriers fill a very definite requirement.

As the trip-leasing legislation was originally proposed in the 83d Congress it would have specifically provided that the Interstate Commerce Commission could not regulate the duration of any trip-lease. At the hearings on S. 898 it became evident that with regard to the nonagricultural aspects of the problem there might be abuses which it would be desirable to control.

S. 898 as reported to the Senate by the committee will clearly establish the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate trip-leasing except with regard to the duration of leases of carriers of agricultural and fishery products. Basically the bill would allow such carriers to trip-lease home after hauling exempt commodities, but would give the Commission authority to restrict general trip-leasing.

As a general proposition the bill would put into law the present provisions of the Commission's proposed regulations. Because of the indefinite history of the proposed regulations it is considered desirable that Congress should clearly establish its policy in this important matter. The principal objection to the bill has come from the railroads and some of the large motor carriers and is to the effect that trip-leasing is detrimental to their operations. The record of the past 10 years clearly shows that the income of these carriers has been steadily rising even though the practice of trip-leasing has been flourishing. The bill as it now stands will protect the legitimate operations

of the exempt carriers, but leave the Interstate Commerce Commission free to otherwise regulate the carriage of goods on the highways.

For these reasons the junior Senator from Maine strongly urges the passage of S. 898.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington one question for the RECORD. The Senator's amendment refers to "transportation of processed or manufactured perishable commodities or products." That means, does it not, that the citrus concentrate pecple of Florida, Texas, and California, as private carriers, would be able to carry their citrus concentrate and single-strength orange juice to the market and then trip-lease in the general direction home?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I was discussing the matter with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. We do not want to leave out apples, of course. We have a great deal in common, although we live far apart geographically. It would include apples. That is the intent. I hope the ICC will follow out that congressional intent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SMATHERS subsequently said: Mr. President, essentially, the trip-leasing bill is a farm bill. The whole motive behind it is to try to help the farmer, and I think in many ways that is what has been done.

As has been pointed out in the debate, trip-leasing at present is a practice which is recognized and accepted by the Interstate Commerce Commission. A private carrier or a farmer, or anyone else, at this moment can trip-lease his truck. However, the Interstate Commerce Commission indicated about 5 years ago that it would not permit the practice of trip-leasing to continue, and it issued order MC-43, which provided that as of a certain date trip-leasing would not be permitted unless the person who trip-leased his truck to a particular carrier did so for a period of 30 days or more.

It was obvious from the order that it was the intention of the Interstate Commerce Commission to do away with trip-leasing. If it had been done away with, it would have cost the farmer a large sum of money. If a farmer in South Carolina wants to send his peaches to market in Chicago or New York, under the agricultural exemption he can carry the peaches to Chicago or New York in his own truck, and is able to sell his produce at a reasonable price.

Recently, the farmer has been able to trip-lease his truck on the return journey. In other words, he may take his truck to a large trucking concern, which has a certificate to carry certain manufactured goods, and say, "I want to trip-lease my truck to you for one trip to South Carolina." In that way, his truck returns loaded, and he makes a little money on the transaction. This means that the expense of moving his peaches from South Carolina to Chicago or New York is less than what it would have been if the practice of trip-leasing were not permitted.

So when the Interstate Commerce Commission indicated it planned to do away with the old practice of trip-leasing, Congress had to do something in order to establish by law the right of the farmer to trip-lease his vehicles. The committee began to consider over a long space of time the different bills which were presented. As a matter of fact, the committee has been trying to solve this particular problem for 3 years. We realized that it was desirable to let the farmer carry to market whatever he might grow, and to give him the right to trip-lease his truck back. That is a provision which is now written into the bill, and we hope it will now become law. That provision is not in the law at this point.

The bill also permits the farmers' cooperatives, which buy trucks and regularly haul to market the produce from the area in which the cooperatives are located, to trip-lease their trucks so that they may return loaded with manufactured goods to the area from which they started, thereby reducing the cost of shipping the original farm produce to the markets.

The bill also makes it possible for the regular haulers—those who are engaged in the business of hauling agricultural products—not the farmers themselves—to trip-lease their trucks. Not only are they given the right to trip-lease their trucks back home, but also they are given the right to trip-lease them once in any direction before starting home.

The reason for that provision is to enable the regular agricultural haulers to move from one harvest area to another. When the citrus crop in Florida becomes ripe at a certain time of the year, the citrus is hauled away to the markets of the North. About that time, as the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], who is at present the Presiding Officer, knows, the peaches in South Carolina begin to ripen, and the agricultural haulers begin to transfer their operations from the Florida area to the areas of Georgia and South Carolina.

After the agricultural commodities of South Carolina and Georgia have been hauled to the markets, the harvesting of crops begins in Texas and California.

So the agricultural haulers have been given the right to trip-lease in any direction. They may go from South Carolina all the way to California while carrying nonagricultural commodities, so that they can get to the new harvest areas and help the farmers in those areas move their produce to the markets. So that provision is now in the bill.

A question on which there was disagreement this afternoon was with respect to the private carrier, who is not in the business of hauling agricultural commodities at all—that is, the big manufacturer, a steel company, let us say, who has a great fleet of trucks and is sending steel to all parts of the country. The farmers originally wanted that kind of private carrier to have the right to trip-lease, even though he had nothing to do with agriculture.

It seemed to us, and it certainly seemed to me, as chairman of the committee, that the fact that the farmer wanted such a provision did not necessarily make it desirable. We felt we had protected the farmer in every way, because what the farmer sought and what the various farm groups wanted with respect to private carriers in many ways had nothing to do with agriculture. If the steel company wanted to ship some steel ties from Pittsburgh to Chicago and thereafter to bring back furniture, that would not be of benefit to the farmers.

So the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington was designed to relate the trip-lease of a private carrier to agricultural products and, therefore, to make it possible for the legitimate agricultural producer to have the benefit of the private carrier. That was the purpose of his amendment.

I said I could not oppose it because it seemed only proper and right to me that farmers should utilize the private carriers, but that only carriers of products processed from the basic agricultural commodities should be permitted to trip-lease.

Farm groups were opposed to that provision in some respects, but I could not go along with them. I believe in the system of regulated transportation.

When Mr. A, who lives in Dallas, Tex., buys a great number of trucks, goes before the ICC, spends money to obtain a certificate which permits him to haul manufactured commodities from Dallas, Tex., to California, submits his rates to the ICC to get approval of them, and pays both a Federal and a State tax on the weight of his truck plus other taxes, I do not believe Congress should destroy his certificate and permit private carriers to go into the same business without any regulation whatsoever.

So it seemed to me the amendment offered by the able Senator from Washington was a fair amendment, and I was happy to vote for it and support it.

As the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] stated earlier, I think we now have a bill which, in my judgment, is the best bill we will be able to get. The truckers are not completely satisfied with it. The railroads are not completely satisfied with it. The farm people are not completely satisfied with it. But it is the nearest bill we can arrive at upon which all the interests concerned can give some semblance of agreement. We have obtained the greatest degree of agreement it is possible to reach on a particular bill.

I think the bill will be of great assistance to the Interstate Commerce Commission. I know it will be of great benefit to the farmers, because the bill writes into the law for the first time the specific agricultural exemptions which he enjoys.

Trip-leasing will not work unless it has the cooperation of all groups, farmers, private carriers, railroads and common carriers alike. The ICC does not have sufficient manpower to enforce all of the regulations. It is already tremendously understaffed. For these reasons, it is important that we have a bill on which

all interests primarily concerned could agree. To do this we all had to give and take a little. As a result we feel that we worked out a satisfactory compromise. Though it does not satisfy everybody completely, it is a measure under which all can work together. I sincerely hope that the Senate will overwhelmingly adopt S. 898 as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL FOREIGN TRAVEL FROM TAX ON TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the acting majority leader a question. Is it contemplated that the Senate will now proceed to take up Calendar No. 1629, House bill 5265?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator from Oregon is as much interested in the bill as I am, and it is my understanding that the majority leader, the Senator from Texas, wishes to have it go over until tomorrow. I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator withhold the suggestion a moment?

Mr. SMATHERS. I withhold the suggestion.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1629, House bill 5265.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5265) to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ACCESS ROADS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the other day I made a speech on the access roads problem wherein I pointed out that the forward-looking lumber interests of my State and of the country have come to recognize the soundness of an access-road program, both from the standpoint of a conservation program and from the standpoint of a sound lumber management economy.

I know of no better proof and documentation of the position I took the other day than is furnished in a very able article which appears in Crow's Pacific Coast Lumber Digest for March 15, 1956, with which I am very glad to associate myself, and should like to make a part of my speech this afternoon.

The article reads as follows:

LOGGERS CONVENE—RISING ROAD COSTS PROBED

One of the major topics at the Willamette Valley logging conference in Eugene March 1–3 was logging roads. Costs are going up. One reason: lack of experienced logging engineers.

The log comes first, then lumber. But before there can be logs there must be roads to reach the timber. If roads cost more than they should, the added expense is passed all along the line. It's included in the final price paid for lumber by the retail yard. If extra costs aren't passed along, someone loses money or goes out of business.

Naturally, these problems are vitally important to the logger. They're also important to the wholesaler or retailer who wonders why lumber prices keep going up.

Mr. President, when I was discussing the access-road problem the other day and pointing out what the attitude of many lumber companies in my State was, I was presenting accurate information as to the attitude of lumber leaders of my State.

The article goes on to say:

GROWING MORE ACUTE

One of the many reasons was highlighted at the Willamette Valley Logging Conference March 1–3 in Eugene, Oreg. It's the shortage of engineers; logging engineers, road-building engineers, forest engineers. There aren't enough to go around, for industry or for the Forest Service. The situation is growing more acute all the time.

Speakers at the conference showed how this scarcity is contributing to higher road-building and logging costs. The shortage refrain ran all through a panel discussion on logging roads, for which the moderator was Starr Reed of the Albany division of M & M Wood Working Co. Panel members were: Aaron Mercer, logging engineer for the Willamette Valley Lumber Co., Dallas; J. Wesley Webb, Webb Construction Co., Salem; Ralph De Moisy, general manager, Mapleton division, U. S. Plywood Corp.; C. E. Remington, assistant regional engineer, United States Forest Service, Portland.

An important part of the problem of added road-building costs was laid at the door of the Forest Service, but it was a give-and-take affair, and Remington parried most of the criticisms with dexterity.

Loggers frequently contend that Forest Service road-building standards are too high. These basic policies Remington defended, but there were other complaints. For instance, Mercer said figures allowed for rock in Forest Service appraisals are often too low—even below cost. Moderator Reed said that if a rigid time schedule is enforced on road-building, despite bad weather, costs are boosted. He suggested more flexibility in interpreting the rules. A speaker from the floor asserted that inexperienced locators can make poor selections of pit sites and thus create added rock-hauling costs. Sometimes larger rock than necessary has to be used, or a crusher has to be employed when this could be avoided with better planning.

Questions of interpretation arise when part of a Forest Service road has been completed and a logger has to use it before the rest of the road has been finished. There have been cases in which Forest Service representatives have required that more rock be put on this used section of road later, an added expense to the roadbuilder which properly should be charged to maintenance.

Remington answered this one by saying it is the policy of the Forest Service to accept a road by sections and pay the contractor accordingly. Repairs on accepted roads after use by loggers are regarded as maintenance and not as a charge against the contractor, he explained. But other speakers indicated there have been difficulties about drawing the line between construction and maintenance. Interpretations are often made by personnel on the job and loggers or contractors are reluctant to go over their heads.

LOCATORS NEEDED

Not all but much of the trouble can be traced to the lack of experienced engineers or other technical employees. On this point Remington said:

"Fellows who graduate as logging engineers don't often go to work for the Forest Service because of the lower pay scale. We need 75 locators in region 6 and we have only a fraction of that number. We recently trained 29 locators, but because of the pay scale we doubt that we'll be able to keep them all on the job."

One of the points stressed by industry and Government witnesses alike at last fall's congressional timber hearings was the need for larger appropriations for Federal timber-managing agencies in order to do an efficient job.

The Senate will recall that when I made my speech on the access road problem the other day I discussed the timber hearings of last fall, and pointed out that this personnel problem was raised. There was general agreement at those hearings not only on the need for access roads but also on the need for larger appropriations for Federal timber-managing agencies for the hiring of expert help so that they could do a more efficient job. That was particularly pointed out in the hearings when we dealt with the problem of coming nearer to the allowable cut in the Federal forests.

The hearings brought out that some of the Federal forests were falling 50 percent short of the allowable cut because they did not have enough help in the Forest Service to process sales. That is not a sound conservation policy. If we let a large stand of timber overripen, let it become diseased, let it become windblown, and do not go in and get that timber out of the woods quickly, we are bound to waste thousands and thousands of dollars of potential Federal revenue.

As this article points out, there is great need for increased appropriations for forestry personnel, so that an efficient management job can be done in handling the people's forests. This would be sound economy.

It is false economy to fail to appropriate the necessary money for access roads and for the Forest Service personnel which is needed for an efficient management of Federal timber. The article points out:

But even if more money is available, where will the skilled men come from? Every other industry is competing for engineers today, offering attractive salaries and training programs to lure graduates.

L. L. Stewart, president of the Bohemia Lumber Co., touched on this subject in addressing the loggers. Stewart is a logging engineer himself, and a Lane County representative in the Oregon legislature. Speaking of the shortage of trained foresters, he said: "We should aggressively work to induce high school boys to go into forestry. As time goes on, more and more foresters will be needed in management jobs."

The same statement probably could be applied to all types of professionally trained men needed by the logging and lumber industries, and by Government. There appears to be no quick and easy answer, and that means keener and keener competition for the available supply of engineers.

Since making my speech the other day, I have heard from lumber operators in my State who support the position I have taken on the need for additional appropriations for access roads and additional appropriations for personnel in the Forest Service agencies of the Government.

I shall continue throughout this session of Congress to discuss this matter frequently on the floor of the Senate, because I want to point out that the policy which Congress is following, appropriation-wise, in respect to the management of the forests belonging to all the people of the country, is costing the taxpayers of the Nation millions of dollars in waste each year. It is waste that, in my judgment, cannot be justified. It is a penny-wise, pound-foolish policy. I think someone must be willing to stand on the floor of the Senate and, by repetition, drum away on the point, until finally we catch the attention and the consideration of the Senate, because I think the taxpayers of the country are entitled to the savings which I am urging.

Before I close on this subject, I shall have to suggest the absence of a quorum, because the reporters, apparently, have taken from my desk some other material I need to use in my remarks. During the quorum call, I shall try to get the material back from the reporters.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to discuss the second part of my speech on this forest problem this afternoon and comment briefly on some of the very important facts set out in the annual report of the Pacific Northwest region of the United States Forest Service. In particular, I should like to call attention to the financial record being made by these 18 national forests in Oregon and Washington.

In fiscal year 1955 their receipts were $39,857,525 and their deposit in the Treasury, before taxes, or gross profit before taxes, was $29,680,135. These forests made "in lieu" payments to counties of approximately $9,682,194, and their net profit to the Treasury was $20,005,941. I do not think that the national forests in any other region can match this record.

On a nationwide basis, the national forests showed a gross profit of $7,692,249 before payments to counties were made, but after paying this amount they had a deficit of $13,210,603.

In the Pacific Northwest our national forests returned to the Treasury two dollars for every dollar spent.

When we come in and request that more access roads be built, that the recreational facilities on the forest be increased, that the inventories be brought up to date so that the full allowable cut can be harvested, we in the Northwest do this with the full understanding that our national forests are capable of producing substantial revenues for the Treasury, do make substantial contributions to local government, and can provide economic and social benefits not only to our region but to the Nation.

I wish to make it very clear to my colleagues in the Senate from other parts of the United States where there are national forests that the return to the Treasury of the United States would be much higher if we had more access roads into those forests. Also the return to the Treasury would be much greater if we appropriated the needed funds for the personnel for a more efficient management of the forests. If, for example, we had adequate personnel it would be possible for the management of Federal forests to cut up to the allowable cut and that would mean profits for the taxpayers of the country.

So, as I said a few moments ago, when I make the fight for more appropriations for access roads and forest personnel, I am making a fight to save the taxpayers of this country a great amount of money, because these forests will more than pay their way. They will pay a large profit to the people of the United States, if we provide the Federal Government forest agencies with appropriations so the forests can be efficiently managed.

I think the annual report of the Pacific Northwest Region of the United States Forest Service amply documents and supports the contentions I have just made. I am offering it for the record this afternoon, and I call attention to the relatively low level of investment in access roads and to the critical shortage of housing for timber sale personnel on the national forests.

I ask unanimous consent that the annual report of the Pacific Northwest Region of the United States Forest Service be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my speech.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNUAL REPORT, FOREST SERVICE, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, PACIFIC NORTHWEST REGION, 1955

INTRODUCTION

The Nation's national forest system is divided into 10 administrative regions. The Pacific Northwest region is composed of 18 national forests in Oregon and Washington. These forests contain a net of 23.5 million acres within their boundaries. They are blessed with rare combinations of scenic beauty; provide important water for power, industrial, and domestic use; provide forage for large numbers of wildlife and domestic livestock; and since about 37 percent of the commercial timberland acreage in Oregon and Washington is within their borders, it is not surprising that this region is the greatest of all national forest regions in the production of timber. Following is a brief summary of major work accomplishments and activities during 1955.

TIMBER MANAGEMENT

Timber sales

A new record was set in calendar year 1955. Timber sold amounted to 2,860,450 thousand board-feet, compared with 2,404,300 thousand board-feet for 1954. A total of 2,729,885 thousand board-feet was cut for which $44,582,518 was paid, or an average of $16.33 per thousand board-feet. In 1954 the cut amounted to 2,585,792 thousand board-feet with a value of $34,787,611. The 1955 cut was 94.5 percent of the allowable annual cut, according to present timber inventories. About one-quarter billion board-feet consisted of salvage of dead or dying timber.

Planting and stand improvement

A total of 10,276,000 seedlings and transplants were produced in Forest Service nurseries at Wind River, Wash., and Bend, Oreg., for field planting throughout the region.

A total of 18,734 acres were reforested by planting and 2,703 acres by seeding. Of this work, 20,159 acres were financed with cooperative sale-area-betterment funds and the remaining 1,278 acres with regular appropriated funds.

Total area successfully reforested by planting and seeding in the region to date is 175,414 acres.

In addition to thinnings of timber stands through commercial sale procedure on several national forests, improvement work was completed on 39,309 acres of young forests. This consisted of 5,523 acres of stand release and thinning and 33,786 acres of pruning. All of this work was financed with cooperative sale-area-betterment funds.

Spruce budworm project

To protect against Spruce budworm killing, 620,950 acres of Douglas-fir and white fir forests were aerially sprayed in 1955 in cooperation with the State of Oregon and private forest owners. Sprayed areas were mostly on the Ochoco, Malheur, and Wallowa-Whitman National Forests. This brings the total treated area for the period of 1949–55 to 3,840,000 acres. Cost of treatment has been about $1 per acre. Results have been excellent. Spruce budworm damage has been reduced to the point where no control activities will be necessary during 1956.

Blister rust control project

We treated 6,162 acres of sugar pine and white pine forests on the Rogue River and Umpqua National Forests to prevent damage from blister rust. In addition, the Forest Service provided technical direction and coordination to blister rust control work done in Oregon and Washington by the Bureau of Land Management and the National Park Service. The Bureau of Land Management treated about 26,000 acres, mainly on and adjacent to the Siskiyou National Forest, and the Park Service completed work on 639 acres at Mount Rainier and Crater Lake National Parks.

Road rights-of-way

Considerable progress was made in obtaining road rights-of-way to permit the construction of timber access roads. During the year action was taken on 128 right-of-way cases. Types of cases, and accomplishment, are listed in the following table:

	Number completed	Number pending
Easements across private land	70	20
Easements across mining claims	6	2
Road-use agreements	6	4
Cooperative construction agreements	2	5
Rights-of-way across public domain	7	0
Stipulations across national-forest land	5	0
Condemnation case		1
Total	96	32

Sustained yield units

No formal cooperative or Federal sustained yield unit applications were received during 1955. However, two submitted previously received attention. One of these was for Wind River Federal Unit. After much study, a hearing was denied the proponents because they failed to qualify on the basis of need at this time. Several informal requests for Federal units were received during the year and given consideration.

Management plans and inventories

Seven revised management plans were approved by the chief during the year. An increase of 100 million board feet of allowable annual cut will be possible as a result of these revisions. This increase reflects the results of reinventories on 7 working circles, which aggregate 3.5 million acres. New inventories were started on an additional 1.2 million acres. Goal for completion of the total reinventory job is the year 1960, but will depend upon funds available to do this work.

Reinventories and management plans as revised have shown increases of allowable cut because of added timber areas which are now considered operable by reason of new logging equipment and methods, the utilization of tree species heretofore not harvested, and the use of a greater proportion of individual trees.

RECREATION AND LANDS

Recreation

Recreational use of the national forests has continued its steady increase. Visits, which numbered 3,810,000 in 1952 increased to 5,192,496 in 1955. During recent years winter sports have become more popular. Ski enthusiasts last year totaled 658,600—a 10 percent increase over the previous year.

Some additional money was appropriated by Congress for sanitation and care of public campgrounds. The increase in funds to our region enabled us to maintain about one-third of the campgrounds satisfactorily and to replace or add 195 pit toilet buildings, 743 tables, and 484 fireplaces. In addition, a number of campground water systems were improved. Despite this accomplishment, the protection of resources from the impact of recreational use is far from satisfactory. It is a major national forest management problem locally and nationally.

Oregon's famous Timberline Lodge on Mount Hood is now under the operation of Richard L. Kohnstamm. The lodge was closed a portion of last year through cancellation of the previous operator's permit because of unsatisfactory operation. Mr. Kohnstamm has done an exceptionally fine job of rehabilitating the lodge and in providing services of which the public may be proud. One of these is the construction of a new chair lift, the upper terminal of which is located adjacent to the west wing of the lodge. The new lift enables skiers to use the fine terrain below the lodge which is sheltered by trees. This area is suitable for skiing during stormy periods when the upper chair lift is unable to operate.

Other major developments constructed this past year at winter-sports areas are two new electric tows in the Ski Bowl at Mount Hood, new pomalifts at both Snoqualmie Pass and White Pass, a new jumping hill at Spout Springs, and a new chair lift on the beginners hill at Stevens Pass.

Water

Important new water facilities within the national forests are being constructed. Near Oakridge, Oreg., on the Willamette Forest preliminary survey work, timber cutting, engineering, and recreation plans are in progress for the Hills Creek Dam area. The dam is being constructed by the United States engineers. The Pacific Northwest Power Co. has applied for a license to construct two new dams on the Snake River, below Hells Canyon. These are to be called the Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley Dams. Preliminary road, trail, and recreation plans have been started for both of them.

Wilderness and wild areas

A public hearing was held in Eugene, Oreg., February 16 and 17, 1955, on a Forest Service proposal to reclassify the Three Sisters primitive area to a wilderness area and make certain changes in the boundary. The region's recommendation was sent to the Chief June 10. We also recommend to the Chief that the Mount Washington wild area (46,655 acres) and the Diamond Peak wild area (35,440 acres) in the Willamette and Deschutes Forests be established.

Mining claims

A flurry of new mining claims occurred following the discover of uranium in the Fremont Forest. It is estimated that about 1,000 new claims were filed on this forest in July and August. Uranium claims were located on other forests in smaller numbers.

During the year about 150 claims of all types on national forests were protested by the Government and 27 were clear listed. Seventeen decisions were issued by the Bureau of Land Management with the following results: Protest upheld on 69 claims (7 cases); 28 claims (6 cases) were declared null and void; 118 claims (2 cases) defaulted and were declared null and void, and on 2 claims (2 cases) the Government was overruled and the claims vindicated. The Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service have joint responsibilities in the administration of mining law on Federal lands.

A milestone was reached on July 23, 1955, with the adoption of Public Law 167. This law represents the first major change in the mining laws since 1872. It gives to the Forest Service authority to manage and dispose of the vegetative surface resources on claims located after enactment of the law, to manage other surface resources (except minerals subject to the mining laws), and to use as much of the surface as necessary for access to adjacent lands. It also establishes a procedure in the nature of a quiet-title action whereby the Government can resolve uncertainties as to surface rights on mining claims located prior to July 23, 1955.

A test area on the Snoqualmie National Forest was selected to determine surface rights under provisions of the law. Preliminary examination was completed to determine who owns the numerous claims within the test area. Affidavits were prepared by those making the examination, setting forth the nature of the examination and the names and addresses of all persons known to have an interest in the claims. Early in 1956 we will notify each claimant that surface rights will be determined on all unpatented mining claims within the test area.

About 125 applications for oil and gas leases on national forest lands were received during the year. Eighty percent of these were on the Siuslaw Forest; about 15 percent on the Ochoco; and the remaining 5 percent on the Fremont and Snoqualmie Forests.

Coffee Pot Flat waterspreading project

The region was allotted $20,000 to invest in waterspreading on Coffee Pot Flat on the Fremont Forest during fiscal year 1956. The money was used to apply early-season runoff, through a series of contour ditches, to more than 300 acres of valley bottom land which had been revegetated. To do this, 25 miles of contour ditches and 1.3 miles of diversion ditch were built. The Coffee Pot area was selected as our highest priority project on the basis of public benefits to be expected from a limited investment. In addition to the tangible benefits of water control and soil stabilization, this project has much value as a demonstration.

Small watershed projects

During 1955, Forest Service participation on small watershed projects (brought about under Public Law 566) increased considerably. This included work on project feasibility surveys, program development, and hydrologic analyses. Preliminary field examinations were made on 9 watersheds in Washington and 7 in Oregon. Feasibility studies were made on 2 watersheds in Oregon and 3 in Washington.

On the Mission Creek watershed protection demonstration project, the Wenatchee National Forest completed 5 miles of fence, 6 miles of new trail, ⅜ mile of channel straightening, and some experimental work in planting and reseeding.

Land exchange

Under Public Law 426, 83d Congress, much progress has been made toward exchanging O. & C. and national forest lands for better administration. The job of appraising the lands has been finished. It is expected that the exchange will be completed and recommendations forwarded to Washington, D. C., well in advance of the date Congress set for its completion.

WILDLIFE AND RANGE MANAGEMENT

Range management

Livestock ranges in the region furnished forage for 89,466 cattle and 164,961 sheep in 1955. These figures represent an increase of 2,232 head of cattle and a decrease of 8,020 head of sheep, compared with 1954.

Grazing receipts were $224,159, about the same as the previous year. Higher market prices to cattle growers in 1954 were reflected by a slight increase in grazing fees for cattle, from 44 cents per cow month in 1954 to 45 cents in 1955. Sheep rates remained the same at 9 cents per sheep month.

Based on preliminary reports, seeding of livestock ranges was as follows: 333 acres of depleted forest ranges; 10,666 acres of logging-disturbed areas, to prevent erosion; and 2,964 acres of accidental burns (project only one-third completed). In addition, 2,200 acres of private land adjacent to the forest will be aerially seeded under cooperative agreement.

Field trials were made using a shortcut method of range inventory. Approximately 100,000 acres were surveyed in that manner.

To put the measurement of range conditions on a scientific basis, the region has started installing lines of permanent study plots, called range transects. Recurrent observations at the same point will give reliable data on the trend of range conditions. Progress in this work has been made, but only about 15 percent of the needed transects have been installed to date.

Wildlife management

Big game numbers continued to increase. The 1955 population estimates, prior to the hunting season, showed 325,000 deer and 53,000 elk on national forest land. The 1955 legal kill is estimated to be a little higher than the 1954 harvest of 68,000 deer and 5,900 elk. Measures were taken to control excess numbers on problem ranges. A number of special early-season and post-season hunts were held and some previously closed areas were opened. Work is progressing on wildlife management plans for the forests. Ten of the 18 forests have submitted their plans; the others are due in 1956.

Above normal snowfall and below normal temperatures over most of the region, exerted pressures on winter game ranges during late 1955. If such conditions prevail winter long, big game losses may run high.

Efforts are being made, in cooperation with State game commissions, to improve depleted ranges and to bring livestock and big game use into proper balance with range conditions.

FIRE CONTROL

The 1955 fire season was average as to number of fires and acreage of burn, but an unusual peak occurred over the Labor Day weekend during the severe fire weather which began August 1 and continued until September 10 to 13. September 4 a series of dry lightning storms began. About one-third of the number of fires for the year and most of the burned acreage came about the ensuing week.

	1955	1954	1950-54 average
Number of fires	[1] 1,013	729	1,040
Acreage burned	16,231	1,692	17,268

[1] The 1,013 fires include 618 from lightning, 140 from careless smokers, and 130 campfires. Man-caused fires numbered 395. Hunter fires were about one-half of the 124 reported in 1954.

Cooperation

Four of our larger fires this year were boundary fires resulting in joint action with the State of Oregon and the Klamath Forest Protective Association. Good cooperative action was taken in extinguishing these blazes. Cooperation of private forest industry was outstanding on many fires, especially during Labor Day weekend. Without this splendid help our losses would have been much greater in view of the critical conditions which prevailed.

Slash burning

Slash burning accomplishment was disappointing on many forests, especially those in western Washington. Fall rains started early and continued without sufficient drying periods to permit effective slash burning in many areas. Disposal of logging slash was only about 50 percent of that planned.

Aerial program

Smokejumpers and aircraft were used extensively during the year. June and September lightning fire concetrations taxed our facilities. Continued modernization of our air fleet took place. We acquired another twin-engined Beechcraft and a Cessna 180, and disposed of a Stinson Voyager. Our regional fleet consists of 6 planes; 3 for transporting smokejumpers and supplies and 3 for passenger travel and reconnaissance.

No fatalities and but few injuries resulted from the smokejumper activity during 1955. Smokejumpers were used interregionally. They played an important role in keeping numerous lightning fires to small size.

New structures and equipment

We purchased 22 additional slip-on tanker units which can be quickly loaded onto a pickup truck or 4-wheel drive vehicle for rapid, economical transportation to fires. A unit consists of a water tank, power-driven pumper, hose reel, hose, nozzles and all accessories needed for pumping water onto a fire. They are used most often near roads but may be hauled into the woods on a tractor-drawn sled.

Four new lookout structures were built and eight others were bettered.

ENGINEERING

Forest highways

Contracts amounting to $2,347,930 were awarded covering 85 miles of forest highway construction in 1955. Forest highways are high class roads on or adjacent to the national forest, used for transportation of forest products or for forest users. Most of this work was reconstruction of obsolete roadways to bring them up to the higher standard needed for modern traffic.

Roads and trails

Most road work in the region continues to be for access to timber areas. Accomplishments were:

Work done with Federal funds

New bridges on timber access roads (11)	$107,000
Bridges replaced with bridges (34)	1,012,076
Bridges replaced with culverts (52)	149,968
Timber access roads, new (25.2 miles)	3,972,921
Timber access roads, reconstructed (37.6 miles)	1,877,081
Other roads reconstructed (20 miles)	75,343

Work done through timber sale contracts (operators)

Bridge construction and replacement (30)	$355,450
Timber access roads, new (549.2 miles)	8,896,769
Timber access roads, reconstruction (205.4 miles)	2,316,994

Other accomplishments

Survey and design (910 miles)	$917,000
Inspection purchaser roads (791.9 miles)	339,117
Trail construction (127.8 miles)	133,709
Roads maintained (11,969 miles)	[1] 861,632
Trails maintained (13,803 miles)	[1] 389,031

[1] Includes regional overhead costs.

Cartography

Accurate, up-to-date maps are basic to the conduct of all multiple-use business on the national forests. For a number of years the region has been modernizing its maps by the use of aerial photographs and photogrammetric methods. This is important to others, also, since Forest Service mapping is made available to other Federal agencies. The States, and forest industries, also benefit. In turn, we obtain aerial photographs and map data from other agencies. Mapping programs are coordinated to avoid unnecessary duplication of work.

Since 1947 planimetric mapping of approximately 44,000 square miles, on a scale of 2 inches to the mile, has been completed. An additional 6,000 square miles is now underway and should be finished by July 1, 1956. Approximately 22,000 square miles are yet to be done. About 75 percent of this mapping is still subject to field editing.

New base maps of each national forest, on a scale of one-half inch to the mile, are being made, based upon planimetric mapping. Three base maps are in progress (about 75-percent completed) leaving 15 to be made.

During the past year aerial photography for mapping purposes, on a scale of 1:20,000 or larger, was accomplished for about 3,000 square miles. Another 1,500 square miles was completed on a scale of 1:40,000. Additional photography is needed. The amount will depend upon the quantity available to the Forest Service from other agencies.

Recreation maps were prepared for the Malheur and Siskiyou National Forest recreation folders, the latter 50-percent completed. Special topographic maps for timber-sale purposes, amounting to 230 square miles, were prepared for 25 separate sales scattered throughout the region.

Communications

We purchased 173 new radios in fiscal year 1955. This expanded the coverage by radio for forest protection. Radio use has also been an aid to better administration of all resource management work. The Forest Service radio laboratory has developed an automatic alarm for lookouts. This automatic alarm, attached to a battery radio, allows a dispatcher to call a lookout during periods when the lookout would normally be off the air. This devise should permit further reduction of telephone lines which are costly to maintain. Radio efficiency has been improved by the installation of remote and relay stations into forest areas not formerly covered. To accomplish this, a low-price remote-control unit for battery radios was developed, which permits operation of a single radio by two or more work stations which may be widely separated.

Automotive equipment

Without increasing the regional vehicle fleet inventory, peak summer needs were met by using some older cars and renting others from Bonneville Power Administration. The regional office and the Snoqualmie National Forest assisted the General Services Administration at Seattle in preparing a motor pool study and report. The auction method of selling old automotive equipment was used for the first time during 1955 with highly satisfactory results.

Building, water and sanitary systems

Architectural plans were prepared for renovation of 7 residences and 6 offices. Plans were prepared for 1 ski-warming hut, a new standard 3-bedroom residence and a 2-bedroom residence. Eight ranger station site plans were made. The Hemlock ranger Station water system on the Gifford Pinchot National Forest is being redesigned and reconstructed for safe domestic use and for adequate supply to the Wind River Tree Nursery. Studies were started for a sanitary system needed to serve this ranger station, the adjacent experiment station headquarters, residences, and the regional training school buildings.

Waterpower projects

Applications for licenses, and preliminary permits for waterpower projects on national forest land, require field examinations as to how these projects affect forest protection, administration, management, and use. Reports must be made to the Federal Power Commission. Eight cases were reported in 1955 and 18 applications are in active status.

In addition, the region has a total of 111 waterpower projects as of January 1, which require regular inspection and reports. Forty-eight of these are major and 52 are minor Federal Power Commission cases. The other 11 cases are projects approved by the authority vested in the Secretary of Agriculture before the existence of the Federal Power Act.

Soil study program

We have recognized the urgent need for more information about soil—to be used in determining proper road locations, adequate road drainage, soil stabilization and other practices involved in the multiple-use management of the forest resources. Work was begun in 1952 to develop satisfactory methods to be used in producing soils maps for extensive areas. As of January 1, 1956, field work mapping, field checking, and written reports have either been finished, or are in various stages of completion for all of the national forests in Washington.

OPERATION

Inadequate housing has become a major problem regionwide. It is of critical proportions in a considerable number of work areas. During the year an intensive survey of housing needs was made for each ranger district. The survey included the deficiencies in residences, ranger office space, small storage and warehouse buildings and other utilities. This survey was correlated with the anticipated program of national-forest development for the next 5 years. It was found we need at least $7 million for this project. It is particularly important that adequate housing be provided for timber-sale personnel if we are to reach our allowable annual cut in a planwise manner.

This critical situation was alleviated somewhat during the year. Eighty-eight house trailers were purchased from other Government agencies. They are being used by families in rapidly expanding work areas. This provides temporary relief in the most critical places until more suitable, permanent housing can be obtained.

During 1955, improvements were made in the operation of our regional office, by making further space adjustments, obtaining additional space, better lighting and air circulation, and necessary office equipment. To handle increased workloads, some additional personnel were added to the regional staff.

The task of preparing our annual budget of over $15 million, exclusive of cooperative work funds, was greater this year than ever before. This was due to: New legislation, including the Fringe Benefits Act; increased

appropriations to finance increasing workloads; salary increases; and refinements in the budgetary processes.

Plans were worked out with the General Services Administration and the Bonneville Power Administration to consolidate blueprinting, photostating, and other reproduction work. This should result in greater efficiency for this phase of the job.

Three other items are of interest. A total of 134 management improvement suggestions from employees were reviewed and processed. A study has been undertaken to develop a procedure for the use of IBM methods in checking truck log-load receipts. Details were worked out whereby a 2-acre tract of land, not needed at the site of the Mt. Hood supervisor's headquarters, was transferred through General Services Administration to Multnomah County, Oreg.

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

Cooperative forest protection

Federal funds allotted to the States under the cooperative Clarke-McNary forest protection program for fiscal year 1956, amounted to $612,679 for Oregon and $560,860 for Washington. This was approximately 25 percent of the amounts spent by the two States for the protection of State and private forest lands. Assistance was given the State forestry departments in developing safety programs and improving fire training and inspection procedures. Special assistance was given to the State Forester of Oregon in the development of job load analysis and standard accounting methods.

A study was begun with State officials to determine the cost of providing a basic level of protection for all State and private forest lands. The report will be completed in 1956 and will be used, in part, for determining distribution of Federal C–M 2 funds to cooperating States.

Cooperative forest management

Beginning with fiscal year 1956, active supervision of the farm forestry program in the State of Washington will be under the State Supervisor of Forestry. This change was initiated by the Extension Service to consolidate and simplify those activities. The Extension Service continues to share the State's portion of the costs. All farm forestry projects in the region are now under the direct supervision of the State Forester.

Federal funds were made available for fiscal year 1956 for the cooperative forest management program in the amounts of $8,162 for Oregon and $11,100 for Washington. Of the total of $47,468 budgeted for the CFM program in Oregon and Washington, $19,252, or 40 percent, was made available through Federal allotment. This helps to provide for 10 farm foresters in the 2 States. One or two more are currently contemplated in the State of Washington.

Information was gathered regarding improved forest survey and inventory techniques through the use of punch cards and electronic calculators. This information was discussed in a conference of public and industrial foresters.

Special analysis of timber resource review data

The region, with the assistance of its many cooperators, obtained additional detailed information on conditions of recently cut timber lands when these were surveyed in the field for the Timber Resource Review. This information appears as a special section for the west coast, in chapter IV–B, Condition of recently cutover lands in the preliminary review draft of the Timber Resource Review. A study is now underway to determine the reasons for unsatisfactory stocking of cutover lands. This condition is prevalent in the smaller woodlands of Oregon and Washington. An effort will be made to determine what might be done to improve stocking of these timberlands.

Cooperative tree planting

Financial and technical assistance was given to State foresters in the production and distribution of 6½ million forest tree seedlings. State nurseries are currently being enlarged to produce more than twice this number of trees.

Agricultural conservation program

Technical forestry information was provided the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Office in the development and execution of the agricultural conservation program. In part, this is a supplement to the farm forestry activities aimed at encouraging improved forest management practices among small woodland owners.

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Training

During 1955 approximately 70 young foresters were appointed to Forest Service positions. This brings the total number of technical foresters employed by the Forest Service in Oregon and Washington to approximately 600.

To accomplish the in-service training for these new men, and other personnel, nine training meetings were held. A 4-day orientation meeting in Portland was attended by 73 new foresters. An administrative and resource management training camp was held at the Wind River training station, attended by 39 trainees. Twenty-three fire control staffmen held a conference at Wind River training station, and an administrative assistants' training meeting at Portland, on the subject of internal audits, was attended by 1 representative from each of the 18 forests. Fifteen field men participated in a range management training meeting at Madras, Oreg.

Four engineering training courses were held as follows:

Course	Location	Trainees
Advanced road location, design and construction.	Portland, Oreg.	20
Bridge course	do	26
Road location	Arboretum (in cooperation with OSC).	18
Staff leadership in road location and design.	Portland, Oreg.	11

Safety

Continued emphasis on accident prevention at all levels of administration, and a near normal fire season (despite the critical fire situation in early September), resulted in the region performing 606,633 man-days of work with the low accident frequency rate [1] of 8.03. There were 33 cases of lost time due to personal injuries, and 6 cases due to occupational illness. The accident severity rate [2] was 1,464, the number of man-days lost on account of personal injuries and occupational illness numbered 7,143, and 1 fatality occurred from firefighting.

Pacific Northwest region, Forest Service—Condensed statement of receipts and expenditures national forest programs, fiscal year 1955

	Receipts	Expenditures	
		Operating	Investments
National forest protection and management and land utilization projects		$4,601,718	$304,436
Fighting forest fires		230,151	
Blister rust control		67,491	
Forest pest control		574,864	
Cooperative range improvements		22,071	
Road and trail system, construction and maintenance		1,398,553	2,870,455
Flood prevention and watershed protection		10,404	
Cooperative deposits	$57,395	89,247	
National forest and land utilization area receipts:			
Forest reserve fund	38,179,777		
Oregon and California lands (national forest)	1,271,251		
Land utilization areas (title III, Farm Tenant Act)	5,789		
Other miscellaneous receipts	343,313		
Total	39,857,525	6,994,499	3,174,891
Comparative total, statewide	82,340,150	50,144,523	24,503,380

Additional computation by the office of Senator MORSE:

Pacific Northwest Region

Receipts		$39,857,525
Operating expenses	$6,994,499	
Investment expenses	3,174,891	
		10,169,390
Gross profit before taxes		29,688,135
Payment in lieu of taxes to local government		9,682,194
Net profit to United States		20,005,941

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have just reviewed the calendar with the distinguished minority leader. The Senate has only about 21 bills left on its calendar. Some of the bills have been passed over since January 1955 and should probably be returned to committee.

Calendar No. 1629, House bill 5265, to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons, is the unfinished business. After we convene on tomorrow, we shall proceed with the consideration of that bill.

I should like to have the Senate be on notice that it may be possible at some time in the not-too-distant future—perhaps on tomorrow, in some instances—for us to consider Calendar No. 235, Senate bill 300, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado; Calendar No. 832, Senate Resolution 131, relating to the refusal of Harvey M. Matusow to answer questions before a Senate subcommittee; Calendar No. 1193, Senate

[1] Accident frequency rate=number of disabling injuries×1 million divided by number man-hours worked.

[2] Severity rate=number of man-days of lost time×1 million divided by number man-hours worked.

Concurrent Resolution 36, requiring conference reports to be accompanied by statements signed by a majority of the managers of each House; Calendar No. 1601, Senate bill 2042, to restore the jurisdiction of the district courts in certain civil actions brought against the United States; Calendar No. 1615, Senate bill 1687, for the relief of Lydia G. Dickerson; and Calendar No. 1595, Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence. I am sure it will not be possible, Mr. President, to arrange to have present on tomorrow all Senators on both sides who are interested in each of those measures; and of course they will not be called up unless the Senators who are interested in them are ready to have them taken up.

I should like to have the RECORD show that although the committees have been very diligent, at this session we have already passed hundreds of bills, and there are less than 21 measures on the calendar. So unless the committees quickly report additional measures, there will not be many important ones for the Senate to consider.

I call the attention of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to the possibility that Calendar No. 1595, Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, may be considered by the Senate on tomorrow. I rather doubt that the Senate will reach it tomorrow, because several Senators who desire to speak on that measure may not be present at that time. But during the evening I shall try to get in touch with them; and if we find that it is possible to have the Senate act tomorrow on the other measures to which I have referred, we shall try to have the Senate take up the Senator's concurrent resolution. We wish to accommodate him if we possibly can.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I desire to thank both the majority leader and the minority leader for giving consideration to the possibility of having the Senate consider on tomorrow Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

I realize there is some opposition to that measure, and that it may not be possible to have the Senate consider it on tomorrow. However, I am very appreciative of the fact that the leaders on both sides are agreeable to having the concurrent resolution considered on tomorrow. On the other hand, if anything prevents its consideration on tomorrow, I wonder whether the majority leader and the minority leader are able to give me assurance that the concurrent resolution will be considered as soon as possible following the recess.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am very anxious to accommodate the Senator from Montana. I spoke to him on yesterday, I believe, about the concurrent resolution. I shall do all I can to have it considered by the Senate as soon as possible; and I shall also do anything else the Senator from Montana wants done, insofar as I am able to do it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in response to the Senator's inquiry, let me say, further, that if it is not possible for the Senate to consider Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 on tomorrow, and still accommodate certain Senators, I shall certainly cooperate with the majority leader in urging that that measure be scheduled for consideration possibly immediately following the action of the Senate on the conference report on the farm bill, which I assume will be ready for our action when we return from the Easter recess.

Although the Senator from Montana knows that I am not supporting his concurrent resolution, nevertheless I believe it should be called up and should be subject to consideration by the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished minority leader, who once again is exhibiting his great sense of fairness. I am perfectly satisfied, on the assurance of both the majority leader and the minority leader, that this measure will receive consideration in due time.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF ON-FARM TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the time for initiating and pursuing programs of institutional on-farm training under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952.

When the GI bill for veterans of the Korean war was passed it included a provision for institutional on-farm training for interested veterans. This program is of particular importance in the State of Montana, where a considerable number of the people rely on farming and ranching.

In some of the more isolated and less populated areas of the State these programs have been delayed because there had been too few qualified veterans to warrant the offering of such training by a school located in the area of their residence. However, the institutional on-farm training class was then started in several Montana cities when interest had increased; but a number of veterans were unable to enroll under Public Law 550 because their 3-year period for the initiation of the program of education or training under the law had expired. I am sure that comparable situations will be found in all the other States.

The bill I am introducing would extend the time when a veteran may start this program. I do not like to see a veteran penalized for not participating in a program which, through no fault of his own, was not made readily available to him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill I have introduced be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3553) to extend the time for initiating and pursuing programs of institutional on-farm training under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 212 (a) of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "except that an eligible veteran may, with the approval of the Administrator, initiate a program of institutional on-farm training at any time within 5 years after his discharge or release from active service."

SEC. 2. Section 213 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"EXPIRATION OF ALL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

"SEC. 213. (a) No education or training shall be afforded an eligible veteran (other than an eligible veteran to whom subsection (b) applies) under this title beyond 8 years after either his discharge or release from active service or the end of his basic service period, whichever is earlier.

"(b) An eligible veteran who initiates a program of institutional on-farm training under this title more than 3 years after his discharge or release from active service may, with the approval of the Administrator, be afforded institutional on-farm training under this title until the end of the 10th year after his discharge or release from active service.

"(c) In no event shall education or training be afforded under this title after January 31, 1965."

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in recess.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, March 29, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 28 (legislative day, March 26), 1956:

UNITED NATIONS

Stanley C. Allyn, of Ohio, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 11th session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Sheldon T. Mills, of Oregon, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Afghanistan.

Jefferson Patterson, of Ohio, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uruguay.

Dempster McIntosh, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Venezuela.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

T. Keith Glennan, of Ohio, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for the remainder of the term expiring May 10, 1958.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Thomas M. Healy, of Georgia, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 28, 1958.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Stephen Sibley Bean, of Maryland, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term expiring August 27, 1960.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

R. Lockwood Jones, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 9, 1960.

Francis Adams Cherry, of Arkansas, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the term expiring March 4, 1960.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Warren E. Burger, of Minnesota, to be United States circuit judge for District of Columbia circuit.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Paul C. Weick, of Ohio, to be United States district judge for northern district of Ohio.

C. William Kraft, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for eastern district of Pennsylvania.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MUNICIPAL COURT OF APPEALS

Leo A. Rover, of the District of Columbia, to be chief judge of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia for term of 10 years.

SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Philip L. Rice, of Hawaii, to be chief justice of the supreme court, Territory of Hawaii, for term of 4 years.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Cable A. Wirtz, of Hawaii, to be judge of the second circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

William L. Longshore, of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Alabama for term of 4 years.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Leonard Andrew Scheele, of Michigan, to be Surgeon General for term of 4 years.

The following appointments in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations, to be effective date of acceptance:

To be senior surgeon

Anibal R. Valle
Paul Q. Peterson
Trois E. Johnson

To be surgeon

Osamu Hayaishi — Frank W. Mount
Gerald R. Cooper — Jack Orloff
Phyllis Q. Edwards — William L. Bunch, Jr.
Henry K. Beye

To be senior dental surgeon

Clarence A. Eggler

To be dental surgeon

Paul H. Keyes

To be sanitary engineer

Arve H. Dahl
Paul W. Reed

To be senior scientist

Lloyd W. Law — Everette L. May

To be scientist

Melvin H. Goodwin, Jr.

To be veterinarian

Raymond J. Helvig

To be senior nurse officer

Mary O. Jenney

To be nurse officer

Doris E. Roberts

To be dietitian

Dorothy M. Youland

To be senior assistant surgeon

John K. Irion — Lesther Winkler
Harold P. Schedl — Samuel G. Southwick
Allen C. Pirkle — Robert H. Parrott
James L. German — Edward F. Wenzlaff
Patrick J. Hennelly, Jr.

To be assistant surgeon

Duane L. Hanson — Lowell H. Hansen
W. King Engel — Donald A. Neher
Theodore A. Labow — Leon N. Branton
Munsey S. Wheby — Alex Rosen
James C. Wooton — Herman L. Smith
Alvin Singer — Hugh S. Pershing

To be assistant dental surgeon

Dale E. Smith

To be nurse officer

Mildred Struve

To be senior assistant nurse officer

Jean C. Casey

To be senior assistant therapist

Josef Hoog — JaNeva I. Porter
Howard A. Haak — John R. De Simio
John F. Burke — Nellie L. Evans

To be assistant therapist

Royce P. Noland — Dean P. Currier
Michael J. Oliva — Lennes A. Talbot, Jr.

To be junior assistant therapist

Arthur J. Nelson, Jr. — John L. Echternach
Dell C. Nelms — James W. Barbero

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 28, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Reginald Wall, of Decatur, Ga., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, it is with a deep sense of unworthiness that we approach Thy throne of grace. Especially during this Holy Week which reminds us of the sufferings of our Saviour do we realize what undeserving creatures and unprofitable servants we are. When we think of all the Christian church has done in her earnest desire to evangelize the world and then face the painful fact that in all of these 2,000 years she has been able to win but little more than one-tenth of the world's people to a saving knowledge of our Lord, when we look up and down the columns of our newspapers and see every page crimson with the history of the broken laws of God and man, when we see the nations of the world unable to adjust their differences and increasing their armaments to a point never known before in history, we are compelled to cry from the depths of needy souls, Lord help us and guide us. We would intercede on behalf of these leaders of our own dear land with whom is entrusted so much responsibility. Enlighten their minds and strengthen their faith in Thee. Grant us such true statesmen in Congress, such godly teachers in our schools, such divinely called and courageous men in our pulpits, and such consecrated Christian parents in our homes till true brotherhood must prevail throughout our world and peace cannot perish from the earth. This we pray through Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8780) entitled "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the conference asked by the House on the bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and other purposes; and appoints Messrs. BIBLE, FREAR and BEALL, as its managers.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9770) entitled "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

RELIEF FROM TAXES ON GASOLINE USED ON FARMS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 8780) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1957)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8780) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2 and 3 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"'(A) by the owner, tenant, or operator of a farm, in connection with cultivating the soil, or in connection with raising or harvesting any agricultural or horticultural commodity, including the raising, shearing, feeding, caring for, training, and management of

livestock, bees, poultry, and fur-bearing animals and wildlife, on a farm of which he is the owner, tenant, or operator; except that if such use is by any person other than the owner, tenant, or operator of such farm, then (i) for purposes of this subparagraph, in applying subsection (a) to this subparagraph, and for purposes of section 6416 (b) (2) (C) (ii) (but not for purposes of section 4041), the owner, tenant, or operator of the farm on which gasoline or a liquid taxable under section 4041 is used shall be treated as the user and ultimate purchaser of such gasoline or liquid, and (ii) for purposes of applying section 6416 (b) (2) (C) (ii), any tax paid under section 4041 in respect of a liquid used on a farm for farming purposes (within the meaning of this subparagraph) shall be treated as having been paid by the owner, tenant, or operator of the farm on which such liquid is used;' " and the Senate agree to the same.

JERE COOPER,
W. D. MILLS,
NOBLE J. GREGORY,
DANIEL A. REED,
By T. A. JENKINS,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
By HARRY F. BYRD,
ROBT. KERR,
EDWARD MARTIN,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8780) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: Subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of section 6420 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as proposed to be amended by the bill as it passed both the House and Senate, prescribe the uses of gasoline which for purposes of the bill are to be treated as use for farming purposes. Senate amendment No. 1 struck out subparagraph (A) and inserted a substitute. No change was made in subparagraph (B), (C), or (D).

Under subparagraph (A) of the House bill, gasoline was to be treated as used for farming purposes if used by "any person" in connection with cultivating the soil, or in connection with raising or harvestng any agricultural or horticultural commodity, including the raising, shearing, feeding, caring for, training, and management of livestock, bees, poultry, and fur-bearing animals and wildlife.

Under Senate amendment No. 1, gasoline used for any of the purposes set forth in the preceding paragraph was to be treated as used for farming purposes only if used by the owner, tenant, or operator of a farm (1) on a farm of which he is the owner, tenant, or operator, or (2) on any other farm (but only if the gasoline used by him on other farms is less than one-half of all gasoline used by him, during the period with respect to which claim is filed, on all farms for the purposes set forth in the preceding paragraph). Thus, under the Senate amendment gasoline used by a custom operator or other independent contractor in performing a service for one of the purposes specified in section 6420 (c) (3) (A) was not to be included in any refund claim.

Under the conference agreement, as under the House bill and the Senate amendment, if gasoline is used on a farm by the owner, tenant, or operator thereof for the purposes set forth above, he will be entitled to the payment provided for under the new section 6420 if he is the ultimate purchaser of such gasoline. In addition, under the conference agreement, if gasoline is used on a farm by any other person for these purposes, the owner, tenant, or operator of such farm is treated as the user and ultimate purchaser of the gasoline, and is therefore entitled to the payment. For example, where a custom operator uses the gasoline, the owner, tenant, or operator of the farm on which the gasoline is used will be entitled to the payment. In general, in the case where a custom operator performs services described in the new section 6420 (c) (3) (A) on a farm, the payment under section 6420 (a) will be made to the person (the owner, tenant, or operator, as the case may be) for whom such services are performed.

Under the conference agreement, comparable rules are provided with respect to diesel fuel and special motor fuels. For example, if a custom operator performs services described in the new section 6420 (c) (3) (A) and uses a special fuel in a motor vehicle, the tax imposed by section 4041 (b) would apply but the owner, tenant, or operator of the farm on which the fuel is used will be entitled to a refund of the tax paid with respect to the fuel used on the farm. As in the case of gasoline, the refund will, in general, be made to the person (the owner, tenant, or operator, as the case may be) for whom the custom operator performed the services.

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3: These amendments are clerical. The House recedes.

JERE COOPER,
W. D. MILLS,
NOBLE J. GREGORY,
DANIEL A. REED,
By T. A. JENKINS,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 8780 as it passed the House would have relieved farmers of the burden of the excise taxes on gasoline and special motor fuels used on their farms for farming purposes. Since the cost of these fuels contributes to the expenses of farming, the bill would have removed the taxes on these fuels from the farmers' operating costs, providing them with approximately $60 million a year by way of tax relief.

The Senate basically adopted the House-passed bill. However, it amended the bill to deny tax relief in certain cases where custom operators, that is, independent contractors, perform services on a farm for a farmer in connection with the raising or harvesting of a crop. The House bill would have granted such custom operators relief from the fuel taxes where they did this work for farmers. The Senate amendment would have reduced the tax relief by $1 million, to about $59 million, as compared to the $60 million of relief under the House-passed bill. The Senate felt that custom operators should be excluded from this relief "because there is no assurance that they will pass the benefit of the refunds on to the farmers." The relief would under the Senate bill generally still have been available to farmers who exchange services with each other provided these services constituted less than one-half of the total services of the farmer.

The conference agreement would grant relief in the case of custom operations for the farmer by allowing a refund with respect to gasoline and special fuels used by custom operators, but the refund will be payable only to the farmer on whose farm the custom work is performed. The conference agreement assures that the farmer will benefit by the tax relief provided in the case of custom operations on his farm.

There also were two clerical amendments made by the Senate, to which the House conferees agreed.

I urge that the bill as agreed to in conference be adopted by the House.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 8780, embodies President Eisenhower's recommendation that the Nation's farmers be relieved of the burden of the Federal excise tax on gasoline used on the farm in the course of farming operations. I introduced a bill to carry out this proposal, as did our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], immediately following receipt of the President's recommendation.

The bill passed the House and the Senate with one major difference. The Senate bill denied the gas-tax relief in the case of so-called custom operations. I believe that the conferees have worked out a provision which resolves this difference very satisfactorily to all concerned. Under the conference agreement, a refund of the gasoline tax is to be available in all cases where gasoline is used for cultivating the soil for raising or harvesting crops, but, under our compromise, the refund will be payable only to the farmer on whose farm the gasoline is used and not to the custom operator. This amendment guarantees that the tax relief will go where we intended it to go, namely, to the farmer himself.

I believe that the Congress is to be commended for acting so promptly upon this recommendation of President Eisenhower.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9064) appropriating funds for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1956)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9064) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,113,440,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$650,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
JAMES C. MURRAY,
GORDON CANFIELD,
BENJAMIN F. JAMES,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
EARLE C. CLEMENTS,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate on the bill (H. R. 9064) making appropriations for the Treasury and the Post Office Departments, and to the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

FEDERAL FACILITIES CORPORATION FUND

Amendment No. 1: Corrects punctuation as proposed by the Senate.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $2,113,440,000 for "Operations," instead of $2,108,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,118,880,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $650,000,000 for "Transportation," instead of $645,000,000 as proposed by the House and $655,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
JAMES C. MURRAY,
GORDON CANFIELD,
BENJ. F. JAMES,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING REVENUE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT No. 1958)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "$12,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "$16,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

HOWARD W. SMITH,
OREN HARRIS,
JOS. P. O'HARA,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALAN BIBLE,
J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.,
J. GLENN BEALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

There were two principal differences between the House version and the Senate version of the bill. The House version contained no exemption from the 2-percent sales and use taxes on the gross proceeds from the rental of textiles, the essential part of which includes recurring service of laundering or cleaning thereof (industrial laundry and diaper service companies). The Senate bill contained such an exemption. Under the conference agreement the Senate provision was retained.

The House version of the bill authorized an appropriation for fiscal year 1957, and each fiscal year thereafter, of $11,000,000 toward defraying the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia. The Senate version raised this amount to $13,000,000. These amounts are in addition to the $11,000,000 authorized for such purposes by section 1 of article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947, as amended. Thus, under the House version the total authorized Federal contribution was $22,000,000, and under the Senate version it was $24,000,000. The House version also provided that so much of the aggregate annual payments by the United States to the general fund of the District of Columbia as is in excess of $15,000,000 for fiscal year 1957, and subsequent fiscal years, would be available for capital outlay only. The Senate bill raised the $15,000,000 figure in the House bill to $17,000,000. Thus under either the House version or the Senate version there would be $7,000,000 available under this authorization for capital outlay. The conference agreement provides for an authorization of $12,000,000 for fiscal year 1957, and subsequent years, or a total of $23,000,000. Of this $23,000,000, $7,000,000 will be available for capital outlays.

HOWARD W. SMITH,
OREN HARRIS,
JOS. P. O'HARA,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1950)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 500) entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That, in order to initiate the comprehensive development of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin, for the purposes, among others, of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, storing water for beneficial consumptive use, making it possible for the States of the Upper Basin to utilize, consistently with the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the apportionments made to

and among them in the Colorado River Compact and the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, respectively, providing for the reclamation of arid and semiarid land, for the control of floods, and for the generation of hydroelectric power, as an incident of the foregoing purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized (1) to construct, operate, and maintain the following initial units of the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities and appurtenant works: Curecanti, Flaming Gorge, Navajo (dam and reservoir only), and Glen Canyon: *Provided,* That the Curecanti Dam shall be constructed to a height which will impound not less than nine hundred and forty thousand acre-feet of water or will create a reservoir of such greater capacity as can be obtained by a high waterline located at seven thousand five hundred and twenty feet above mean sea level, and that construction thereof shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has, on the basis of further engineering and economic investigations, reexamined the economic justification of such unit and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress and to the President that, in his judgment, the benefits of such unit will exceed its costs; and (2) to construct, operate, and maintain the following additional reclamation projects (including power-generating and transmission facilities related thereto), hereinafter referred to as participating projects: Central Utah (initial phase); Emery County, Florida, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minnesota unit, a dam and reservoir on Muddy Creek just above its confluence with the North Fork of the Gunnison River, and other necessary works), Pine River Extension, Seedskadee, Silt and Smith Fork: *Provided further,* That as part of the Glen Canyon Unit the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument.

"SEC. 2. In carrying out further investigations of projects under the Federal reclamation laws in the Upper Colorado River Basin, the Secretary shall give priority to completion of planning reports on the Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, Navajo, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, San Miguel, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, Animas-La Plata, Yellow Jacket, and Sublette participating projects. Said reports shall be completed as expeditiously as funds are made available therefor and shall be submitted promptly to the affected States, which in the case of the San Juan-Chama project shall include the State of Texas, and thereafter to the President and the Congress: *Provided,* That with reference to the plans and specifications for the San Juan-Chama project, the storage for control and regulation of water imported from the San Juan River shall (1) be limited to a single offstream dam and reservoir on a tributary of the Chama River, (2) be used solely for control and regulation and no power facilities shall be established, installed or operated thereat, and (3) be operated at all times by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior in strict compliance with the Rio Grande Compact as administered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission. The preparation of detailed designs and specifications for the works proposed to be constructed in connection with projects shall be carried as far forward as the investigations thereof indicate is reasonable in the circumstances.

"The Secretary, concurrently with the investigations directed by the preceding paragraph, shall also give priority to completion of a planning report on the Juniper project.

"SEC. 3. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this Act, and in authorizing priority in planning only those additional projects designated in section 2 of this Act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive development as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the Upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the Upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River Compact and to each State thereof by the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated. It is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this Act shall be within any national park or monument.

"SEC. 4. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, in constructing, operating, and maintaining the units of the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects listed in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto): *Provided,* That (a) irrigation repayment contracts shall be entered into which, except as otherwise provided for the Paonia and Eden projects, provide for repayment of the obligation assumed thereunder with respect to any project contract unit over a period of not more than fifty years exclusive of any development period authorized by law; (b) prior to construction of irrigation distribution facilities, repayment contracts shall be made with an 'organization' as defined in paragraph 2 (g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) which has the capacity to levy assessments upon all taxable real property located within its boundaries to assist in making repayments, except where a substantial proportion of the lands to be served are owned by the United States; (c) contracts relating to municipal water supply may be made without regard to the limitations of the last sentence of section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; and (d), as to Indian lands within, under or served by any participating project, payment of construction costs within the capability of the land to repay shall be subject to the Act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564): *Provided further,* That for a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water from any participating project authorized by this Act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301 (b) (10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security. All units and participating projects shall be subject to the apportionments of the use of water between the Upper and Lower Basins of the Colorado River and among the States of the Upper Basin fixed in the Colorado River Compact and the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, respectively, and to the terms of the treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

"SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby authorized a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund (hereinafter referred to as the Basin Fund), which shall remain available until expended, as hereafter provided, for carrying out provisions of this Act other than section 8.

"(b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, other than section 8, shall be credited to the Basin Fund as advances from the general fund of the Treasury.

"(c) All revenues collected in connection with the operation of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects shall be credited to the Basin Fund, and shall be available, without further appropriation, for (1) defraying the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriation acts: *Provided,* That with respect to each participating project, such costs shall be paid from revenues received from each such project; (2) payment as required by subsection (d) of this section; and (3) payment as required by subsection (e) of this section. Revenues credited to the Basin Fund shall not be available for appropriation for construction of the units and participating projects authorized by or pursuant to this Act.

"(d) Revenues in the Basin Fund in excess of operating needs shall be paid annually to the general fund of the Treasury to return—

"(1) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to power pursuant to section 6 of this Act, within a period not exceeding fifty years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

"(2) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to municipal water supply pursuant to section 6 of this Act, within a period not exceeding fifty years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

"(3) interest on the unamortized balance of the investment (including interest during construction) in the power and municipal water supply features of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (f), and interest due shall be a first charge; and

"(4) the costs of each storage unit which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 6 of this Act within a period not exceeding fifty years.

"(e) Revenues in the Basin Fund in excess of the amounts needed to meet the requirements of clause (1) of subsection (c) of this section, and to return to the general fund of the Treasury the costs set out in subsection (d) of this section, shall be apportioned among the States of the Upper Division in the following percentages: Colorado, 46 per centum; Utah, 21.5 per centum; Wyoming, 15.5 per centum; and New Mexico, 17 per centum: *Provided,* That prior to the application of such percentages, all revenues remaining in the Basin Fund from each participating project (or part thereof), herein or hereinafter authorized, after payments, where applicable, with respect to such projects, to the general fund of the Treasury under subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (d) of this section shall be apportioned to the State in which such participating project, or part thereof, is located.

"Revenues so apportioned to each State shall be used only for the repayment of construction costs of participating projects or parts of such projects in the State to which such revenues are apportioned and shall not be used for such purpose in any other State without the consent, as expressed through its legally constituted authority, of the State to which such revenues are apportioned. Subject to such requirement, there shall be paid annually into the general fund of the Treasury from the revenues apportioned to each State (1) the costs of each participating project herein authorized (except Paonia) or any separable feature thereof, which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 6 of

this Act, within a period not exceeding fifty years, in addition to any development period authorized by law, from the date of completion of such participating project or separable feature thereof, or, in the case of Indian lands, payment in accordance with section 4 of this Act; (2) costs of the Paonia project, which are beyond the ability of the water users to repay, within a period prescribed in the Act of June 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 181); and (3) costs in connection with the irrigation features of the Eden project as specified in the Act of June 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 277).

"(f) The interest rate applicable to each unit of the storage project and each participating project shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by calculating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations during the month of June next preceding the fiscal year in which said advance is made, on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum.

"(g) Business-type budgets shall be submitted to the Congress annually for all operations financed by the Basin Fund.

"SEC. 6. Upon completion of each unit, participating project or separable feature thereof, the Secretary shall allocate the total costs (excluding any expenditures authorized by section 8 of this Act) of constructing said unit, project or feature to power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control, navigation, or any other purposes authorized under reclamation law. Allocations of construction, operation and maintenance costs to authorized nonreimbursable purposes shall be nonreturnable under the provisions of this Act. In the event that the Navajo participating project is authorized, the costs allocated to irirgation of Indian-owned tribal or restricted lands within, under, or served by such project, and beyond the capability of such lands to repay, shall be determined, and, in recognition of the fact that assistance to the Navajo Indians is the responsibility of the entire nation, such costs shall be nonreimbursable. On January 1 of each year the Secretary shall report to the Congress for the previous fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1957, upon the status of the revenues from, and the cost of, constructing, operating, and maintaining the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects. The Secretary's report shall be prepared to reflect accurately the Federal investment allocated at that time to power, to irrigation, and to other purposes, the progress of return and repayment thereon, and the estimated rate of progress, year by year, in accomplishing full repayment.

"SEC. 7. The hydroelectric powerplants and transmission lines authorized by this Act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but in the exercise of the authority hereby granted he shall not affect or interfere with the operation of the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act and any contract lawfully entered unto under said Compacts and Acts. Subject to the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, neither the impounding nor the use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Colorado River storage project shall preclude or impair the appropriation of water for domestic or agricultural purposes pursuant to applicable State law.

"SEC. 8. In connection with the development of the Colorado River storage project and of the participating projects, the Secretary is authorized and directed to investigate, plan, construct, operate, and maintain (1) public recreational facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for the development of said project or of said participating projects, to conserve the scenery, the natural, historic, and archeologic objects, and the wildlife on said lands, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas created by these projects by such means as are consistent with the primary purposes of said projects; and (2) facilities to mitigate losses of, and improve conditions for, the propagation of fish and wildlife. The Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and to withdraw public lands from entry or other disposition under the public land laws necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the facilities herein provided, and to dispose of them to Federal, State, and local governmental agencies by lease, transfer, exchange, or conveyance upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest. All costs incurred pursuant to this section shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

"SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Rio Grande Compact of 1938, or the Treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

"SEC. 10. Expenditures for the Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, Curecanti, and Navajo initial units of the Colorado River storage project may be made without regard to the soil survey and land classification requirements of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954.

"SEC. 11. The Final Judgment, Final Decree and stipulations incorporated therein in the consolidated cases of *United States of America* v. *Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District, et al.*, Civil Nos. 2782, 5016 and 5017, in the United States District Court for the District of Colorado, are approved, shall become effective immediately, and the proper agencies of the United States shall act in accordance therewith.

"SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this Act, but not to exceed $760,000,000.

"SEC. 13. In planning the use of, and in using credits from, net power revenues available for the purpose of assisting in the payout of costs of participating projects herein and hereafter authorized in the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the Secretary shall have regard for the achievement within each of said States of the fullest practicable use of the waters of the Upper Colorado River system, consistent with the apportionment thereof among such States.

"SEC. 14. In the operation and maintenance of all facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the Treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits, as a defendant or otherwise.

"SEC. 15. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to continue studies and to make a report to the Congress and to the States of the Colorado River Basin on the quality of water of the Colorado River.

"SEC. 16. As used in this Act—

"The terms 'Colorado River Basin', 'Colorado River Compact', 'Colorado River System', 'Lee Ferry', 'States of the Upper Division', 'Upper Basin', and 'domestic use' shall have the meaning ascribed to them in article II of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact;

"The term 'States of the Upper Colorado River Basin' shall mean the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming;

"The term 'Upper Colorado River Basin' shall have the same meaning as the term 'Upper Basin';

"The term 'Upper Colorado River Basin Compact' shall mean that certain compact executed on October 11, 1948 by commissioners representing the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by Act of April 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 31);

"The term 'Rio Grande Compact' shall mean that certain compact executed on March 18, 1938, by commissioners representing the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by Act of May 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 785);

"The term 'Treaty with the United Mexican States' shall mean that certain treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed at Washington, District of Columbia, February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and other rivers, as amended and supplemented by the protocol dated November 14, 1944, and the understandings recited in the Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, advising and consenting to ratification thereof."

And the House agree to the same.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill S. 500, "To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River Storage Project and participating projects, and for other purposes," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the language agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report. The language incorporates the recommendations of the conference committee with respect to each of the differences between the Senate and House bills.

SCOPE OF THE PROJECT

With respect to the scope of the project, the conference committee agreed to retain in the bill for authorization only the four storage units and eleven participating projects in the House-approved bill.

The matter of retaining intact our national park system was an important issue in the consideration by Congress of this legislation. The House-approved bill—

(1) deleting the Echo Park storage unit,

(2) requiring "protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument", and

(3) expressing the "intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this Act shall be within any national park or monument",—

makes clear the intention of the House that there be no invasion or impairment of the national park system by the works authorized to be constructed under this legislation. The conference committee upheld the House position and adopted the House-approved language.

The Juniper project would have been authorized as a storage unit by the language in the Senate bill. The House language would have required the Secretary to give priority to completion of a planning report on the Juniper unit in the event he found the Curecanti unit infeasible. The conference committee adopted substitute language which requires that priority be given to completion of a planning report on the Juniper project but removes the contingency in the House language and does not specify whether the Juniper project is to be a storage unit or a participating project.

The conference committee adopted House language requiring the Secretary to give priority to completion of planning reports on certain participating projects including those, except Woody Creek, which would have been conditionally authorized by the language in the Senate bill.

The sum of $760 million remains in the bill as the amount authorized to be appropriated. However, the conference committee, in retaining this amount in the bill, agreed that it should not be earmarked projectwise and that there is no prohibition against the use of such funds for the construction of the Curecanti unit, subject to the certification by the Secretary required in section 1 of the act.

REPAYMENT PLAN AND BASIN FUND

With respect to the repayment plan incorporated in the legislation, the conference committee agreed to and adopted language in the Senate bill, which requires the repayment with interest of costs allocated to power in not to exceed 50 years—a requirement that is in accordance with presently established policy.

The House-approved bill contained language setting out certain accounting and funding requirements to be made applicable to the basin fund. The conference committee adopted the language of the House bill, which provides for the establishment, from surplus power revenues of the storage project, of credits, within the basin fund, to each State of the upper basin for financial assistance to irrigation development in such State. It should be understood that the revenues thus credited to the States are only for use, within the individual States, in assisting the construction of Federal reclamation projects and shall not be used for any other purpose.

INDIAN LANDS

The House-approved bill contained language making nonreimbursable the costs allocated to irrigation of Indian lands which are beyond the capability of such lands to repay. The conference committee agreed to and adopted substitute language limiting this provision to the Navajo participating project. This language was adopted in recognition of the fact that assistance to the Navajo Indians is the responsibility of the entire Nation and not just the upper basin States.

OPERATION OF POWER FACILITIES

Section 7 of the House-approved bill, containing a grant of authority to the Secretary of the Interior relating to operation of the power facilities authorized to be constructed by S. 500, has been amended by the conference committee in two respects.

The first sentence of section 7, directing the Secretary to operate such facilities so as to produce the greatest amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm rates, has been amended through adoption of substitute language which relates to the grant of authority to the Secretary, and provides that such operation—

"* * * shall not affect or interfere with the operations of the provisions of the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act and any contract lawfully entered into under said compacts and acts."

This language has been adopted to make clear the intent that all of the instruments constituting the law of the Colorado River shall be read together by the Secretary of the Interior in the operation of the power facilities authorized to be constructed, operated, and maintained by this legislation.

In a similar vein, the conference committee has adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the House-approved language contained in the second sentence in section 7. The language of this sentence, which deals with the impounding and use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Colorado River storage project, has been rewritten to make clear the intent of Congress that, subject to the provisions of the Colorado River compact, such impounding and use shall be subservient to the appropriation of water for domestic or agricultural purposes.

APPROVAL OF FINAL COURT DECREE RELATING TO BLUE RIVER WATER

The Senate bill contained language authorizing conveyance to the city of Denver of certain water rights used for the production of power at Green Mountain Dam on the Blue River in Colorado. The conference committee adopted substitute language. These water rights have been the subject of prolonged litigation between the United States, Denver, and water users on both the eastern and western slopes of Colorado in the consolidated cases of the *United States of America* v. *Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District, et al.*, in the United States District Court for the District of Colorado. Since the Senate action on S. 500, agreement has been reached between representatives of the eastern slope and western slope of Colorado and a final decree has been filed by the United States District Court in this matter. Copies of the final decree and stipulations have been submitted to the Congress. The substitute language adopted by the conference committee gives immediate congressional approval to the final judgment, final decree and stipulations, and instructs the proper agencies of the United States to act in accordance therewith.

PLANNING OF FUTURE PROJECTS

With respect to House language in section 13 of the bill relating to the planning of future projects by the Secretary, the conference committee adopted substitute language which does not change the intended purpose of this section. The intention of the language is to require the Secretary, in planning additional developments in the upper basin, to give consideration to achievement, within each of the States, of the fullest practicable use of the water apportioned to each State. Since, under section 5, revenues to assist irrigation development are apportioned to the States on the basis of the estimated percentages of upper basin water remaining to be developed in each such State, the intention of this section could also be stated as requiring the Secretary, in planning future projects, to give consideration to the revenues which it is anticipated will be available for repayment of such projects.

CONSENT TO SUIT OF UNITED STATES

Section 14 of the bill, which gives consent to joinder of the United States as a party to an action or actions by any State of the Colorado River Basin asserting noncompliance with the provisions of law made applicable by this section, has been amended to make clear the intent of Congress that the United States may be joined as a party thereto as a defendant or otherwise.

QUALITY-OF-WATER STUDIES

The House-approved bill included language in section 15 requiring the Secretary of the Interior to make certain quality-of-water studies. The conference committee adopted substitute language which, although not as specific, accomplishes the same purpose and recognizes that such studies are already required by law and are under way.

OTHER DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HOUSE AND SENATE LANGUAGE

With respect to all other major differences between the House and the Senate bills not discussed hereinbefore, the conference committee concurred in and adopted the House language.

In conclusion, one additional observation appears in order: throughout the hearings and deliberations of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on this legislation, in Floor presentation and debate, and in the several sessions of the conference committee, there has existed unity of understanding and agreement on the purpose of this legislation. That purpose is to authorize the construction of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects and to provide for the operation of the facilities thereof in accordance with the law of the Colorado River.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman with respect to the repayment provisions found in the conference report. As I understand, the provisions of the House bill were taken out and the provisions of the other body agreed to. Is that correct?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct, and that represents the only major change in the bill as passed by the House. The Senate provision called for a repayment of both the irrigation and the power features in 50 years. The bill that passed the House required equal annual installments of 50 years on the irrigation features, thus deferring for a somewhat longer time the repayment of the power features. The Bureau of the Budget

preferred the language of the Senate bill, and as a consequence of that and in order not to encounter any difficulties with the Bureau on that subject, we took what we regarded as the more restrictive language as far as payout time is concerned of the Senate bill.

Mr. HOSMER. That would be restrictive as to the payback period?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct. In other words, the current policy of the Bureau of the Budget is not to look beyond 50 years, and they did not like the provisions of the House bill which permitted the power features to go beyond 50 years for their final payout. So, we restricted it to 50 years on each of them, which made it necessary for us to take out the provisions of the House bill calling for equal annual installments.

Mr. HOSMER. Do the provisions now require that both the power and the irrigation features be paid back within the 50-year period?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct.

Mr. HOSMER. Is there any priority between them in the event the revenues do not provide sufficient money for the repayment?

Mr. ENGLE. The power features have to pay out in 50 years with interest. In other words, what we actually did in the House was this: We had a priority for the irrigation features with 50-year equal installments. We took that out, and what it boils down to is that the power features have to pay out with interest in 50 years, and if there is not enough money to pay for them both the final payment on the irrigation features has to come in later.

Mr. HOSMER. The irrigation features are nonreimbursable, as far as interest goes, to the United States Treasury, and the longer they remain unpaid, the more interest cost is involved.

Mr. ENGLE. That is true in all reclamation projects. So, the repayment program we have in this bill is exactly the same as other projects. The one we had in the House was really more onerous to the landowners because they had to pay interest longer.

Mr. HOSMER. One other question with respect to the $760 million authorization. I notice that the Curecanti Dam provisions have been somewhat liberalized in that the Secretary can now, if he chooses, build Curecanti or commence to build it, and I am wondering, inasmuch as the cost of Curecanti was not considered in arriving at the authorization figure, if the committee intends that some of the other projects be deleted or that an increase in the authorization will be sought at a later time.

Mr. ENGLE. If they run out of money, they will have to come back to Congress. We left it just exactly as it was in the House bill. The conference report simply points out that we never set up any priority as among projects; in other words, they can start with whatever is best to start out with, and if they do not have enough money, they will have to come back to Congress for additional authorization.

Mr. HOSMER. As the bill now stands, there is not enough money to go around for all the projects authorized.

Mr. ENGLE. Well, we cannot be too sure about what the situation is going to be 25 years hence.

Mr. HOSMER. Even if the cost remained the same, the possibilities now with regard to Curecanti, which were not considered before, do not make the authorization sufficient on the basis of presently estimated cost for the approved projects involved.

Mr. ENGLE. If they run out of money they have to come back for additional money. They cannot start a project for which they do not have sufficient money to complete and, as a consequence, it is, in effect, saying when they run out of money they are going to have to come back for another authorization.

Mr. HOSMER. The gentleman means that we have more or less written a blank check?

Mr. ENGLE. No, sir; we have not. They can keep building on what they are authorized to build, and when and if the money runs out a new and further authorization will have to be given by Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD, on the conference report just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, in respect to the conference report on S. 500, now under consideration, I would like to say there were a number of Members of the House who, like myself, supported this measure when it was considered here 3 or 4 weeks ago. I supported the authorization with the understanding from the committee in charge of the bill, as well as the supporters of the measure, that although this is an authorized project, it will, if appropriations are approved, be what may be known as self-liquidating, and that only approximately 1 percent of the cost of the project will really be charged to the Federal Treasury. When this legislation was considered in the House, the chairman stated that 99 percent of the capital investment will be paid from reclamation funds presently on hand amounting now to about $27 million, together with income to be obtained from the use of the project, including income from power and income from reclamation. So because of the small amount of charges against the general taxpayers of the country, I went along with the majority of the House.

The proponents of this bill insisted that major crops grown on the irrigated land will not be the kind that will come in competition with crops grown in other areas, especially those in surplus. As a matter of fact, an amendment was adopted in the House to take care of that situation.

If I thought the authorization of this project would provide for a substantial charge against the taxpayers of this country, I would not support it. We were informed by the proponents of the measure, including the chairman of the committee that approximately 1 percent of the entire cost of the project would finally come out of the Federal Treasury.

I am also advised that the approval of this legislation will to a considerable degree, alleviate a situation in regard to the Navaho Indians who will use a part of the land when irrigated to provide food for themselves so they will not be dependent upon the expenditure of millions of dollars of food costs from the Federal Treasury.

PUT SOME SENSE IN FARM SURPLUS DISPOSAL

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the House-Senate conference committee now working on the farm bill could bring some sense and some reason to the surplus food disposal program by adopting, as part of the compromise bill, a food stamp plan such as proposed in my bill, H. R. 5105. This would assure getting some of the surplus to those in our country who are in need—many of them actually hungry. Let us feed our own needy as well as the poor of other nations.

The Senate bill provides for up to $500 million for sending surplus food abroad, including shipping costs. If we can afford that—and I am sure we can—then we can certainly afford the cost of distributing some of this surplus to needy Americans under a food-stamp plan. We have already bought and paid for this food. Let us distribute it.

The differences between the House and Senate farm bills are so great that the conference committee would have adequate authority to adopt a food-stamp amendment as a compromise provision. I urge the House conferees to suggest such an amendment. I urge its adoption by the conference committee.

We have over 5 million Americans on different forms of public welfare assistance. Each one needs—actually needs—some of this surplus food. These are people who do not now get enough to eat. Let us use this blessed surplus—this abundance—to help feed the hungry here at home as well as abroad.

The Sullivan bill for a food-stamp plan, H. R. 5105, is as follows:

H. R. 5105

A bill to provide for the establishment of a food stamp plan for the distribution of $1 billion worth of surplus food commodities a year to needy persons and families in the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote the general welfare, raise the levels of

health and of nourishment for needy persons whose incomes prevent them from enjoying adequate diets, and to remove the specter of want, malnutrition, or hunger in the midst of mountains of surplus food now accumulating under Government ownership in warehouses and other storage facilities, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is hereby authorized and directed to promulgate and put into operation as quickly as possible, a program to distribute to needy persons in the United States through a food stamp system a portion of the surpluses of food commodities acquired and being stored by the Federal Government by reason of its price-support operations or other purchase programs.

SEC. 2. In carrying out such program the Secretary shall—

(1) distribute surplus food made available by the Secretary for distribution under this program only when requested to do so by a State or political subdivision thereof;

(2) issue, or cause to be issued, pursuant to section 3, food stamps redeemable by eligible needy persons for such types and quantities of surplus food as the Secretary shall determine;

(3) distribute surplus food in packaged or other convenient form on the local level at such places as he may determine;

(4) establish standards under which, pursuant to section 3, the welfare authorities of any State or political subdivision thereof may participate in the food stamp plan for the distribution of surplus foods to the needy;

(5) consult the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Labor, in establishing standards for eligibility for surplus foods and in the conduct of the program generally to assure achievement of the goals outlined in the first section of this act; and

(6) make such other rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall issue to each welfare department or equivalent agency of a State or political subdivision requesting the distribution of surplus food under section 2 (1) food stamps for each kind of surplus food to be distributed, in amounts based on the total amount of surplus food to be distributed and on the total number of needy persons in the various States and political subdivisions eligible to receive such food. The food stamps shall be issued by each such welfare department or equivalent agency to needy persons receiving welfare assistance, or in need of welfare assistance but ineligible because of State or local law, and shall be redeemable by such needy persons at local distribution points to be determined by the Secretary under section 2 (3).

SEC. 4. Surplus food distributed under this act shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) granted needy persons by a State or any political subdivision thereof.

SEC. 5. In any one calendar year the Secretary is authorized to distribute surplus food under this act of a value of up to $1 billion, based on the cost to the Federal Government of acquiring, storing, and handling such food.

SEC. 6. The distribution of surplus food to needy persons in the United States under this act shall be in place of distribution to such needy persons under section 32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C., sec. 612c), as amended, and section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this act shall affect distribution of surplus food presently provided for in such sections other than to needy persons as defined in section 7 of this act.

SEC. 7. For the purposes of this act a needy person is anyone receiving welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) from the welfare department or equivalent agency of any State or political subdivision thereof, or who is, in the opinion of such agency or agencies, in need of welfare assistance but is ineligible to receive it because of State or local law.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor, shall make a study of, and shall report to Congress within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, on the feasibility of, the costs of, and the problems involved in, extending the scope of the food stamp plan established by this act to include persons receiving unemployment compensation, receiving old-age and survivor's insurance (social security) pensions, and other low-income groups not eligible to receive food stamps under this act by reason of section 7 of this act.

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations have until noon on Saturday to file a report from its Subcommittee on International Operations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations have until midnight tonight to file a report on certain activities in the Department of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

FILLING VACANCY IN BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 122) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, be filled by the appointment of Everette Lee DeGolyer, a citizen of Texas, for the statutory term of 6 years, to succeed Harvey N. Davis, deceased.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FILLING VACANCY IN BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 123) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, be filled by the appointment of Crawford Hallock Greenewalt, a citizen of Delaware, for the statutory term of 6 years, to succeed Vannevar Bush, resigned.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FILLING VACANCY IN BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 124) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, be filled by the appointment of Caryl Parker Haskins, resident in the city of Washington, for the statutory term of 6 years, to succeed Owen Josephus Roberts, deceased.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the other day the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] made a distinguished speech on the floor in which he outlined the means by which the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, had made payments on cheese to restaurants, cheese to dealers, and to distributors that the Comptroller General ruled were unauthorized and improper. In the course of that speech he contrasted the legal action which was instituted by the Department of Agriculture against 281 wheat farmers who had violated their marketing quotas, wheat farmers who only owed the Government less than $500

apiece. And the prompt institution of prosecution and attempt to recover from these wheat farmers against the failure to try to recover for the cheese.

I suggest, however, that Secretary Benson knew that his program for farm people, and for the wheat farmers especially, was such that they were going to be bankrupt, so he proceeded promptly to recover the money for the Government. We should not be too critical of his actions.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS AND OBSOLETE GOVERNMENT AND CONGRESSIONAL PUBLICATIONS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, accompanied by staff members of the House Subcommittee To Investigate Federal Printing and Paperwork, I recently inspected storage rooms containing hundreds of thousands of surplus and obsolete books which were printed for the House and Senate Libraries and the House folding room. This vast quantity of books, for the most part still in their original wrappings and stored in the subbasement of the Library of Congress and elsewhere, represents an accumulation which has developed over a long period of time, extending far back into the last century. Many of these books have only salvalge value, but some undoubtedly have historical value and may be of considerable interest to libraries and educational organizations. It is also likely that historical groups, like the Ford Foundation, in Dearborn, Mich., will avail themselves of any opportunity that may develop, to acquire such publications as will make some valuable contribution to their collections of Americana and history-making memorabilia.

It is my understanding that the chairman of the Committee on House Administration has referred the report of this accumulation to the Joint Committee on the Library. It is hoped that the disposal recommendations which it prescribes will take cognizance of the potential historical value of many of the books.

An inventory and proper disposition of this mountainous accumulation will well be recognized as a real progressive step toward giving the true value to the purpose for publishing these books and at the same time releasing thousands of square feet of valuable floor space which is presently used to entomb these books.

SECURITY PROCEEDINGS

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I arise on this occasion to comment on one of the most significant decisions of the present administration.

This was the recent decision by the Department of Justice not to appeal to the Supreme Court a lower court's decision condemning the use of secret informers in security proceedings. An answer has been long overdue to the controversial question of whether an accused security risk has a constitutional right to know and face his accusers or whether, as the Government has contended, informants' names must be kept secret in the interest of national security.

Last October, the United States court of appeals in San Francisco held that the Coast Guard's security program for maritime workers was unconstitutional because the seamen were not told of the sources of the charges against them. In its decision, the court denounced what it called a system of secret informers, whispering, and talebearers. Since that time there has been much interest in speculation as to whether the Justice Department would petition the Supreme Court to review the case.

When we consider the strong position which the Justice Department took last year in the case of Dr. John P. Peters against any requirement for confrontation in security cases, it seems strange that this same Department has now affirmatively decided not to appeal this position to the Supreme Court. And I think it is worth pointing out that this decision not to appeal was made by Solicitor General Sobeloff after consultation with and with the concurrence of Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr.

I do not think I am overstating the case, Mr. Speaker, when I say that this decision signals a significant victory for civil liberties in the United States. But the battle is not yet won. The decision of the court of appeals, which now becomes the law of the land, simply affirms the constitutional rights of a private employee accused of being a security risk to know and face his accusers. It is still possible, for a Federal employee, similarly accused of being a security risk, to lose his job without knowing or having the opportunity to face his or her accusers.

In other words, what constitutes due process of law for a private employee is now very different from that which constitutes due process of law for a Government employee. It is argued that working for the Government is a privilege, not a right, and that a Government worker is therefore not entitled to the constitutional guaranty of due process—including confrontation of his accusers. How much longer, I wonder, are we going to be content to find excuses for a security system lacking both in principle and honesty.

This question has been only partially answered, Mr. Speaker. Not only are Government employees still in doubt, but many thousands of others as well. On two occasions before, I have called attention to the fact that honorably discharged veterans of the Korean conflict are having their prisoner-of-war compensation denied them on the grounds that they collaborated with the Communists. Are these men to examine the evidence against them? No indeed. Are they allowed to face their accusers? No, indeed. Have they the opportunity of cross-examining those who have furnished derogatory information against them? Again, the answer is "No." And have they the right to court review? No, again. The simple fact, Mr. Speaker, is that these American veterans are not accorded even the suggestion of traditional American justice.

Certainly it is true that an efficient, intelligent security system is necessary for the protection of our Nation. But a security system which is unnecessarily destructive of our individual liberties cannot be tolerated. We cannot sit idly by while the freedoms are being flagrantly abused—all in the name of "security."

The decision of the court of appeals on this subject is well worth reading, Mr. Speaker. In part, the court says:

> It is unbelievable that the result (of this decision) will prevent evil officials from procuring proof. * * * But surely it is better that these agencies suffer from handicap than that the citizens of a freedom-loving country shall be denied that which has always been considered their birthright.
>
> Indeed it may well be that in the long run nothing but beneficial results will come from a lessening of such talebearing. It is a matter of public record that the somewhat comparable security risk program directed at Government employees has been used to victimize perfectly innocent men.
>
> The objective of perpetuating a doubtful system of secret informers likely to bear upon the innocent as well as upon the guilty * * * cannot justify an abandonment here of ancient standards of due process.
>
> Furthermore, in considering the public interests in the preservation of system under which unidentified informers are encouraged to make unchallengable statements about their neighbors, it is not amiss to bear in mind whether or not we must look forward to a day when substantially everyone will have to contemplate the possibility that his neighbors are being encouraged to make reports to the FBI about what he says, what he reads and what meetings he attends. * * *
>
> The time has not come when we have to abandon a system of liberty for one modeled on that of the Communists.

INVESTIGATION OF DAILY WORKER

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a paradox developed. The internal-revenue men closed up the Daily Worker offices at the same time we were discovering the Daily Worker enjoys second-class mailing privileges for its mail. Therefore, in effect, the Daily Worker gets a subsidy from our own Government which the Postmaster General is not happy about. The paradox is that apparently here in the United States of America a revolution is all right so long as you pay your taxes—and if you pay taxes the United States will subsidize the revolution. I think the United States is the only country in the world that subsidizes those who try to overthrow it. I

call upon our Committee on the Civil Service and Post Office to look into the matter and bring those who own and manage the Daily Worker before that committee so we may inquire how far our own Government is going in spending its own money to destroy itself—in other words, to commit hara-kiri.

The subsidy enjoyed by the Daily Worker, through cheap second-class mailing privileges, should be ended. The overthrow of our free Government should not be subsidized by the Government itself.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file reports on the following bills: H. R. 7679, H. R. 8123, H. R. 8490, H. R. 8674, H. R. 9260, H. R. 9263, H. R. 9824, H. R. 10046.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CORPORATE TAXES AND SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, I introduced legislation designed to ease one of the most onerous burdens which over the years small business has had to bear.

Most small corporations have been unable to expand and grow in the American tradition because of the heavy imposition of income taxes. In the past, in addition to the normal tax we have had for many years surtaxes which applied to small as well as to large corporations. It was not until recently that an exemption of $25,000 was made available in the surtax bracket. We know also that the normal tax rate of 25 percent of the taxable net income was raised to 30 percent and that increase in the normal tax rate still applies.

The bill which I introduced will not decrease revenue. It will, however, encourage the growth of small corporations. It will encourage thousands of businesses presently operating as individuals or partnerships to take advantage of an opportunity to place their businesses on a sound corporate basis. The corporate tax base would be broadened and within a reasonable period corporate tax revenue would be increased. At the same time, small corporations would be able to keep pace with their larger competitors in plant modernization which is imperative in an era of rapid technological development.

In providing relief for small corporations it is not intended, nor do I propose, to penalize corporations simply because they are large. As a matter of fact, under my bill until earnings exceed $700,000 there is no increase in the corporate tax. The increase above $700,000 amounts to only 2 percent more than the present effective rate of 52 percent or 54 percent. I consider this increase temporary, and it is my expectation that if this bill is enacted into law, a general corporate tax reduction would take place within the foreseeable future. Of course, we must remember that our present high tax rates are the result of wars and the necessity for the maintenance of a strong national defense. Few, if any, of us I believe are not willing to pay our fair share of the national-defense budget. At the same time, in order to keep our economy strong and healthy we must place a great deal of emphasis on the words "fair share."

I do not believe that we can continue to tax corporations without taking into account ability to pay. We apply that principle, after a fashion, to individuals and despite the opinions of some of our theorists and experts, I believe that a truly equitable graduated income tax for corporations is as sound from an economic viewpoint as a graduated tax for individuals. I desire to emphasize also that our corporate tax structure must not be confiscatory to large corporations nor have the effect of stultifying the growth of small corporations. I repeat that I hope my bill will receive serious consideration by the Ways and Means Committee this year. I also hope that the majority will see fit to schedule hearings on this most important and critical problem of small and independent business.

The tax rates which are proposed in H. R. 9851 are as follows:

If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $5,000	10 percent of the taxable income.
Over $5,000 but not over $25,000.	$500, plus 20 percent of excess over $5,000.
Over $25,000 but not over $100,000.	$4,500, plus 40 percent of excess over $25,000.
Over $100,000	$34,500, plus 54 percent of excess over $100,000.

BAGGAGE ALLOWANCES AND EXCESS BAGGAGE RATES BY AIR

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and to include a joint resolution introduced by me today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. Speaker, when the Douglas DC–3's, Lockheed Lodestars, and Boeing 247–D's were the big all-metal luxury airliners, the infant airlines accepted passenger weight. We used to have to get on scales and be weighed in, personally, with briefcases, overcoats, and baggage.

Those were the days when a full load of passengers sometimes crowded out gasoline in making total gross weight limits. Oh, sometimes the mail bumped a passenger, or even two occasionally. But total gross was a very important figure, with CAA inspectors riding incognito and waiting to check load manifests.

It was in that time that 40 pounds—the minimum packed weight of a small suitcase—was established as the allowable weight without an excess baggage charge being levied on the sometimes unsuspecting passenger. Of course, there were those who filled their topcoat pockets with the heavier toilet articles and there were those who managed to hide briefcases from the eyes of vigilant countermen. It is still that way.

And then I remember when the weighing-in process got to be such a nuisance that test runs were made on weight manifests to find out what the average passenger weighed. I do not remember whether said passenger was weighed during the summer or in winter, but anyhow, the figure 160 pounds came out. A very convenient figure, that. Add it to 40 pounds of baggage and you round out 200 pounds. Very neat.

That evidently accounts for the nice little figures on the inside back cover of the Official Airline Guide. There it declares that excess baggage rates shall be figured at one-half of 1 percent of the applicable one-way adult fare. In other words, the excess baggage rates shall be the same as the passenger rate per pound.

So it is not difficult to figure. If the fare to Duck City is $64, the excess baggage rate per pound is 32 cents. But Duck City is exactly 1,000 miles distant so again it is easy to figure the passenger rate per mile. Divide $64 by 1000 and you have $.064 per mile as the answer.

It is also easy to figure passenger cost per ton-mile if you just figure that 10 passengers equal 1 ton and multiply $0.064 by 10. The answer $0.64. So the passenger pays 64 cents per ton-mile for himself and baggage.

Of course, in this discussion we have not mentioned air mail or air mail rates. And we shall refrain, because comparisons are odious either way you slice them. Neither will we discuss air express.

Suppose we talk about passenger fares in foreign commerce for a while. If a passenger is destined from Copenhagen to Los Angeles—or vice versa—he can carry 66 pounds of baggage all the way on his ticket and pay no excess baggage charge. If he flies SAS direct, there is no problem. And if he flies Pan-Am to New York and any domestic carrier to Los Angeles, there is no problem either, because he is a preferred customer on the domestic carrier. No excess baggage is charged anyone who has a portion of foreign travel on his ticket.

Take for example the Cuban who makes a round trip from Habana to Washington with a stop-over at Miami, and the Washingtonian who intends to spend some time in Miami, including in his plans possibly a trip to Habana. It is the same for both, except in the matter of our Federal transportation tax which the Cuban, of course, escapes. In what follows, the 10 percent Federal tax is not included.

The Washington-Miami round-trip costs our well-dressed passenger with 66 pounds of baggage $63.30 plus $63.30 less 5 percent, or $120.27, plus .005×$63.30 ×26×2 or $16.64 excess baggage round trip. Total: $136.91. Add to that a

round trip to Habana from Miami—on which trip he is entitled to carry 66 pounds of baggage—at a cost of $36 and you have a total trip cost of $172.91.

But if he were to buy a round-trip from Washington to Habana with a stopover in Miami, he would be entitled to carry 66 pounds of baggage all the way and the total cost of the ticket is $155.30, a saving of $17.61. So the smart Washingtonian going to Miami buys a round-trip ticket to Habana whether he carries excess baggage or not, because the Washington-Miami round-trip carrying 40 pounds of baggage—$120.27—plus the Miami-Habana round trip allowing 66 pounds of baggage—$36—about equals the Washington-Habana round trip at $155.30, carrying 66 pounds all the way. So if any excess baggage is to be carried to Miami and a Habana trip is contemplated, it is actually cheaper to buy a through ticket, whether you use all of it or not. You might get a refund on the unused portion.

How silly can we be? A Cuban can travel all over the United States, if he is ticketed for it, carrying 66 pounds and the only difference between him and the American is that he flew over the 90 miles of the gulf. I suppose that entitles him to an advantage.

Now, just for a lark, let us consider a round trip from San Francisco to Habana by way of an interchange. First, the fare to Miami via Los Angeles-Dallas-Atlanta costs $174.40. So the excess baggage charge is 87 cents per pound. The round trip is $331.36 carrying 40 pounds. The round trip Miami-Habana is $36 carrying 66 pounds. So if you buy a ticket to Miami and return and then decide you want to visit Habana—you are that close—it costs $367.36 total. But if you bought a through round trip to Habana with stopover privileges, it only costs $355.51, and 66 pounds can be carried all the way.

But to add insult to injury, you will have to add excess baggage charges in on the San Francisco-Miami traveler, which, at 26 pounds at 87 cents times 2 equals $47.24. So the Miami round trip with 26 pounds excess costs $378.60 as against the Habana round trip with the same baggage costing $355.51, and if the Miami passenger decides to go on to Habana it is $36 more, or $414.60 transportation that he could have purchased for $355.51—a $59.09 saving.

Now, let us take a look at the Washington-Los Angeles round trip. If made entirely in the United States, the one-way fare is $149.35 and the round trip $283.86, and the excess-baggage rate is 75 cents per pound. If 66 pounds is carried, the round trip plus excess baggage at $39 is $322.80.

But if the trip is made via Mexico City you are offered that side trip—and you can make it either or both ways—for $59 additional over the round-trip fare, or a total of $342.80, and carry the 66 pounds without excess charge. So we come up with the fact that the side trip to Mexico City is really a bargain to the 66-pound baggage person—it only costs $20 net extra.

On mileage, it is really a bonanza. Washington-Mexico City is 2,123 miles; Mexico City-Los Angeles 1,640 miles, for a total of 3,763, or 7,526 miles round trip. Washington-Los Angeles round trip is 4,620 miles. So it will cost $20 for 2,906 extra miles of flight, or $.007 per mile if the Mexico City privilege is used both ways. That is the cheapest passenger transportation I know of anywhere.

The United States air carriers certainly discriminate against Americans who travel in the United States and in favor of foreigners and those Americans who travel abroad. You might think that the domestic carriers get something extra out of foreign ticketing, but they do not. They carry the extra baggage without a whimper.

But let someone say that the domestic carriers ought to treat Americans at least as well as they treat foreigners and a cry goes to high heaven that someone is robbing them of revenue.

Now to go from the ridiculous to the sublime, let us consider a trip to Honolulu. You can buy a first-class ticket from the east cost to Hawaii over any airline or combination of airlines that serve both ends of your trip and carry 66 pounds of baggage the whole way without extra charge.

The same thing is true of the first-class passenger who flies to Alaska. He too can carry, en route, 66 pounds all over the United States free of charge.

As a matter of fact the 40-pound limit applies only within the continental United States and Canada.

Abroad they recognize that passengers paying first-class fares should receive first-class treatment as to baggage allowance. Abroad you can carry 66 pounds anywhere on a first-class ticket. A tourist or second-class passenger can carry 44 pounds.

A United States coach-flight passenger to Hawaii or Alaska is entitled to carry 44 pounds just like the European tourist. It is only the continental passenger who is limited to 40 pounds.

But even sadder—the coach passenger in the United States and Canada has to pay the same excess-baggage charge as the first-class passenger, in spite of the fact that his ticket costs two-thirds as much. He must pay premium rates on excess baggage. Even the air mail travels for far less.

This is a situation that in air travel is as antique as the 247–D. It should be brought down to date. The same baggage allowance should persist all over the world for the same class of ticket, and this discrimination against the domestic traveler should be abolished. It should be done voluntarily by the carriers, but I have prepared a bill designed to accomplish it if they do not.

Then we might suggest that additional extra luggage could be carried in the same plane at freight rates. When that happens—the passenger with baggage will feel free to travel anywhere by air.

The joint resolution is as follows:

House Joint Resolution 595

Joint resolution to amend section 404 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, with respect to excess baggage charges collected by air carriers

Whereas under the tariffs filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board by air carriers, passengers holding tickets entitling them to transportation only in domestic air transportation must pay an excess baggage charge for baggage weight in excess of 40 pounds; and

Whereas, on the other hand, under the tariffs applicable to overseas and to foreign air transportation and to domestic air transportation when included with either overseas or foreign air transportation, first-class passengers are not required to pay an excess baggage charge except for baggage weight in excess of 66 pounds, and coach or second-class passengers in such transportation are not required to pay an excess baggage charge except for baggage weight in excess of 44 pounds; and

Whereas there are certain situations in which first-class passengers who are actually traveling between points in the United States may be able, at little extra cost because their tickets permit foreign travel, to carry up to 66 pounds of baggage without having to pay an excess baggage charge; and

Whereas coach or second-class excess baggage charges and weight allowances in domestic air transportation are the same as those applicable to first-class passengers, thus providing an even heavier discrimination against coach passengers; and

Whereas the result is severe discrimination against users of both first-class and coach or second-class passenger service in domestic air transportation only which neither the domestic air carriers as a group nor the Civil Aeronautics Board has done anything to correct: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That section 404 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C., sec. 484), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"EXCESS BAGGAGE CHARGES

"(d) The Board shall prescribe just and reasonable excess baggage charges which may be collected by air carriers, and no air carrier may collect any excess baggage charge which is not authorized by the Board. Such charges prescribed for any class of service shall be the same in the case of each type of air transportation. For the purposes of this subsection the types of air transportation shall be held and considered to be interstate air transportation, overseas air transportation, and foreign air transportation."

AGRICULTURE

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture [Mr. COOLEY] stated that the Secretary of Agriculture left with the Committee on Agriculture a draft of a bill on the 27th day of February, which was printed as a committee print but has not been introduced as yet, and further stated:

The Secretary has not been able to prevail upon any Member of the House, either Republican or Democrat, to introduce the bill which he proposed.

While that particular print was not introduced as a bill, similar legislation was then pending before our committee. The soil-bank legislation proposed in the committee print was introduced by Congressman HOPE as H. R. 8543 and by me as H. R. 8544 on January 17, 1956. These bills contain many of the sections

in the committee print and the titles were such that any recommendation made by the Secretary of Agriculture in the committee print could have been adopted under H. R. 8543 or 8544.

So this legislation was before the Committee on Agriculture. Beginning on page 22 of the committee print, title III, "Agricultural Credit," are provisions amending the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act which were introduced by me as a separate bill on March 8, as H. R. 9843.

A subcommittee has held hearings on bills identical to title III of the committee print, so this legislation has been introduced and is before the Committee on Agriculture.

In fact the titles of these bills are so written that any of the changes suggested by the committee print would be germane to the Hope and Hill bills.

RESEARCH PROGRAM FOR DEVELOPING INCREASED USE OF FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, on March 22, 1956 I introduced H. R. 10148, a bill to provide for a scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products so as to reduce surpluses of such products and to increase the income of farmers, and for other purposes.

This bill is identical with the bill introduced by Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, and others in the Senate—S. 3503. As a farmer, I can appreciate this forward-looking approach to the solution of the farmers' problems. Unfortunately, too many approaches to the farm problem have been from the viewpoint of securing votes instead of actually helping the farmer. The present plight of the farmer actually is the result of the continuance of such a program and the farmer is entitled to an intelligent and honest approach to the solution of depressed agricultural conditions whenever they may arise.

H. R. 10148 is not a substitute for H. R. 12 which is in conference committee at the present time. It is an approach to the long term study of further uses of agricultural products, marketing research, and other ideas that will be of specific interest and help to the agricultural economy. I hope that the agriculture committee will give early and serious study to this bill and similar bills that have been submitted.

IMPORTS OF CHERRIES IN BRINE FROM ABROAD

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of communications from the cherry growers and processors organizations in the State of Washington which indicate their real concern over the possibility of reductions in tariffs on imports of cherries in brine from abroad. These cherries can be produced in foreign countries much cheaper than they can be produced here because of the cheaper labor and production costs abroad. That being the case, the foreign producer can place his product on the American market at a lower price than can his American counterpart.

Any further reductions in tariffs on this product, coupled with increases in the amount of imports, will drive the domestic producer out of his own market and will put him out of business. There are about 20,000 growers and producers in the Pacific Northwest who are affected by this problem and all of them are sincerely worried about their present and future welfare.

These people, through their organizations, urge that Congress act to protect their industry. They want no further reductions in tariff on imported cherries in brine, and suggest that a quota be placed on the amount of imports. Certainly their requests should be given favorable consideration.

AGRICULTURE BILL

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on Monday when the question of the recess was approached by the leadership of the House, I suggested that we ought to have a rollcall, and I said that I would insist on a rollcall unless I could be convinced that there was no possibility at all of bringing in a farm bill between now and the 9th of April. The leadership yesterday convinced me that it would be impossible to get a workable bill here—one that we understood and on which a report could be written that could be understood, and to bring in a bill which would be a good farm bill. So I am not going to ask for a rollcall on the resolution calling for a recess. I do suggest that the leadership in the House and on the Committee of Agriculture that they work hard to bring in a good bill that can be voted upon as soon as the Congress returns on April 9. The report should be clear and spell out all provisions of the bill. Time is of the essence. Agriculture needs a good bill, not one salted and seasoned with political gadgets.

The bill from the Senate with 40 amendments is a political hodge-podge of contradictory provisions. It is not workable or acceptable to the White House. Let the report on the bill be one understood and acceptable to those charged with its administration. I offer the suggestion in the hope that it will not be a political Christmas tree or something that the President will have to veto. The action of the conference committee so far is to the effect that a bill will be presented to this House that will not be acceptable to the other end of the avenue. From the sidelines it appears that there are those who hope the President will have to veto a farm bill. I trust the administration can also give and bend a little in order that a new agriculture bill can be promptly enacted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

RECESS, MARCH 29–APRIL 9, 1956

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 226).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That when the 2 Houses adjourn on Thursday, March 29, 1956, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 9, 1956.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERIM AUTHORITY TO THE SPEAKER AND THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until April 9, 1956, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

INTERIM APPOINTMENT AUTHORITY TO THE SPEAKER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until April 9, 1956, the Speaker be authorized to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 1956

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday, April 11, 1956, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR AND PRIVATE CALENDAR TO BE CALLED APRIL 9

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, April 9, 1956, it shall be in order to consider business under clause 4, rule XIII, the Consent Calendar rule, and also that it shall be in order to consider business under clause 6, rule XXIV, the Private Calendar rule.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do this so we may learn the rest of the program for the week of April 9, if the gentleman from Oklahoma can inform us.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the minority leader, Monday, April 9 is District day, but there is no business.

As indicated in my request, both the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar will be called.

On Tuesday the bill H. R. 9893, the Military Installations bill, will be called up and Tuesday devoted to general debate.

On Wednesday the bill H. R. 9893 will be read under the 5-minute rule and it will be followed on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday by the following bills:

House Resolution 400, investigations, coal industry.

H. R. 5299, authorize Virgin Islands National Park.

S. 1188, examination of national banks.

S. 1736, qualifications of national bank directors.

H. R. 9285, extend authority, direct purchase bill.

H. R. 8750, Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act.

Conference reports may be called up at any time.

Any further program will be announced later.

Mr. MARTIN. Is there anything scheduled for tomorrow?

Mr. ALBERT. There is no business scheduled for the balance of this week.

Mr. MARTIN. I did not note in the gentleman's listing of the program any reference to the farm legislation.

Mr. ALBERT. I would like to advise the distinguished minority leader that I have announced that conference reports may be called up at any time.

It is planned to bring up the conference report on the farm bill as soon as it is ready.

Mr. MARTIN. Could we not get unanimous consent to have that filed during the recess so that it can be brought up on Monday, April 9?

Mr. ALBERT. I think the gentleman from North Carolina intends to make that request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE FARM BILL

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that if and when the conference report on the bill, H. R. 12, is ready for printing we may have it printed and made available to the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman going to bring that up on Monday the 9th or on Tuesday the 10th for a vote in the House?

Mr. COOLEY. I have no control over the program. I assume it cannot be brought up on Monday the 9th. I am advised that no RECORD will be printed during the recess. The conference report will have to be printed in the RECORD of Monday, the 9th, and will be available on Tuesday, the 10th.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then will a vote come before Wednesday the 11th?

Mr. COOLEY. I understand there is a primary election in Illinois on Tuesday, the 10th, so it appears to me it cannot possibly be called up before Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I am a little disturbed over waiting until Wednesday. The farmers are waiting to get word as to where they stand.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is not half as much disturbed as I am, but that is the situation we are in and we have no control over the matter.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did the acting majority leader say anything about the State Department appropriation bill? I am interested in that bill because it provides for several hundred additional employees in a tremendously increased budget. I am somewhat interested in the Federal Government paying $47 for wastepaper baskets for the State Department. Can the gentleman say whether that bill is coming up immediately after recess? I remember a year ago when we came back from the Easter recess that that State Department appropriation bill was called up immediately.

Mr. ALBERT. I may advise the gentleman it has been the practice to program appropriation bills as soon as they are ready. We have programed a number already.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the gentleman will not program that bill for action immediately after we return from the Easter recess.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT TIRE DEALERS SAY IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT CONGRESS STRENGTHEN THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, small business is asking for protection against a monopolistic practice which destroys small business. This should not be confused with big businesses' "bad faith." Small business is not asking for protection against bad faith. Protection against bad faith is already provided in the law as a result of a majority opinion of the Supreme Court's Standard Oil Company of Indiana against FTC.

EFFECTIVE ANTITRUST LAWS MUST CURB BIG BUSINESS ABUSE OF POWER

The effect of the Standard Oil opinion was to tell big business that it is perfectly all right to go ahead and discriminate in prices—which is to bring abuse of power into the competitive contest—just so long as big business is discriminating in good faith. In other words, the effect of the Court's interpretation of the Robinson-Patman Act is that it is all right to create a monopoly in good faith, and to use in good faith a method which destroys the smaller competitors, which keeps new competitors out of the market and ultimately but surely creates monopoly.

A law against bad faith is inadequate on two counts. First, it is too vague and nebulous to be enforceable, and it amounts to no protection at all. Second, it is irrelevant to the central problem. If we are to preserve even a vestigal state of competition, we must have antitrust laws which protect against monopoly. We must have antitrust laws which keep the door of opportunity open, so that small business, big business, medium size business, and every other business, may take its chances of succeeding on the basis of its efficiency. This means that the antitrust laws must place an effective curb on abuses of power; we cannot allow methods of competition by which the biggest firm will inevitably win and take over the markets, while the smaller firms will inevitably be squeezed out. It matters not whether these methods are employed in good faith or bad faith.

H. R. 11 will correct the misinterpretation of the Robinson-Patman Act which the Supreme Court made in the Standard Oil of Indiana opinion. It will thus restore to small business some equality of opportunity to survive and to succeed. It will help in a significant way to stop the tremendous numbers of small-business bankruptcies and failures which are now taking place in a period of unprecedented big-business profits. The Members know, I think, that there is a petition on the Clerk's desk to call up H. R. 11 for debate and a vote. If there should turn out to be as many as 218 Members of the House—that is a simple majority—who sign the petition, we can make certain of having a chance to vote on, and to pass, H. R. 11 during this Congress.

ALL SMALL BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS HAVE ASKED FOR PASSAGE OF H. R. 11

Last November, when the Small Business Committee was holding hearings on small-business problems, representatives of every small-business organization came before our committee and entered a plea for legislation to correct the Supreme Court's misinterpretation of the Robinson-Patman Act and to return to small business the full protection against price discrimination which that act was intended to provide.

One of these small-business organizations is the National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc. This organization has 2,500 members, doing business in all 48 States and the District of Columbia. These members are independent tire dealers—mostly retailers but also some wholesalers—and they are

not tire manufacturers or big chain distributors.

Mr. W. W. Marsh, executive secretary of the National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., testified before our committee on November 4 and entered on behalf of this association a plea that Congress pass legislation to correct the Standard Oil decision. I know that all Members will be interested in Mr. Marsh's statement, which I am inserting in part, as follows:

REQUEST OF INDEPENDENT TIRE DEALERS

It is essential to the preservation of the purpose of the Robinson-Patman Act that Congress modify the rationale of the Standard Oil decision to provide that good faith shall remain an effective defense except where the discrimination may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

The present status of the good-faith defense permits the same disadvantages and discriminations against the small buyer through the exercise of market control of large distributors in a particular market as pertained prior to the act.

Certainly the fact that a distributor sets a lower price in a market which may be far removed from his establishment that he would from his local market gives rise to necessity for an explanation or justification. Thus, the ability to control the market by meeting a low price of a competitor, which may in itself be the result of an unlawful conspiracy, will result in the same abuses which the Robinson-Patman Act was intended to correct.

This association feels that the theory and spirit of the Robinson-Patman Act is vital to the continuance of small independent businessmen in this country. When it is weakened or when wedges are driven into it to permit circumvention, as the Standard Oil case has done, the small-business man is in a very vulnerable position.

One fallacy of the reasoning of those who support the rationale of the Standard Oil decision is that it emphasizes only the lower price and gives no attention whatsoever to the higher price which must exist if there is to be a price discrimination. The low price, it is said, is a response to competition and that if a company is denied the right to discriminate to meet the lower price, that company may sell only at the higher price, which would reflect a weakening of competition.

But why should not this lowering of price then be available to all of its customers instead of just to some of them? It is certainly reasonable to assume that no businessman gives a price concession unless competition forces him to.

Systematic and continuous discrimination by dominant sellers, though in good faith, may equally discourage the price competition of smaller rivals and result in the very monopoly or market control that the act attempts to discourage.

Therefore, the good-faith defense should not apply to systematic and continuous discrimination practice by dominant sellers.

The only way to accomplish this is by amending the act to provide that the good-faith defense not be an absolute one if the effect of the price discrimination be to lessen competition or encourage monopoly.

We appreciate the opportunity to appear before this committee and to present the views of the independent tire dealer to the Small Business Committee, which has done so much to protect and preserve the competitive status of the independent businessman.

* * * * *

The hope for the future of the independent tire dealer lies in the hands of this committee and its administrative counterpart.

DECISION OF COURT OF CLAIMS WITH REFERENCE TO INDIAN LANDS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the other day Mr. Perry Morton, who is one of the Assistant Attorneys General in the Department of Justice, testified before an Appropriations Committee that because of certain recent decisions of the Court of Claims, this country would have to buy its Indian lands all over again, and suggested that additional legislation either in language in a forthcoming appropriation bill or in the legislative committee in charge, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, be passed in order to foreclose the recent decision of the Court of Claims.

That decision was the decision of Otoe and Missouri Tribes of Indians, and it is reported in volume 131, Court of Claims Report, at page 593.

The first question that was to be decided by the Court of Claims was whether the Congress, in creating the Indian Claims Commission did create a new cause of action for the Indians.

This is what the court held:

We think it is quite clear from the face of the Indian Claims Commission Act that in its passage Congress was, to a certain extent, exercising its political function of creating certain new causes of action and recognizing liability in the United States, if the facts warranted, in connection with such causes. In fact, the act clearly creates causes of action and permits suit thereon which would not have been possible, and are not possible, as far as we know, between private individuals.

One of the new causes of action that was created, that the Court of Claims allowed the Indians to bring, was a claim under Indian title. The Court defines Indian title as that of exclusive possession, occupancy and use from time immemorial.

The Government, in the Otoe case took the position that even if the Congress did create new causes of action based on the revision of treaties for unconscionable consideration, or on lack of fair and honorable dealings by the United States, there is nothing in the act which indicates a congressional intent to create a cause of action in the claimant, or to admit the existence of a liability in the Government, where the treaty sought to be revised, or the dealings claimed to be unfair, involve land held by the Indan claimants by aboriginal use and occupancy title, Indian title, rather than reservation or treaty title.

The Otoe case decided that claims brought by the Indians which involve claims based on the payment of an unconscionable consideration under a treaty cession of land were proper claims for Indian title under the Indian Claims Commission Act. Having so decided, that the new cause of action was created, they decided against the Government and gave the Indians a claim.

When the Department of Justice lost the lawsuit in the Court of Claims, and when the Supreme Court of the United States declined to take jurisdiction on a writ of certiorari, they have come back to the Congress and said to us it was not the congressional intent to allow for such claims as were involved in the Otoe case.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear from an examination of the legislative history of the Indian Claims Commission Act, it is clear from an examination of the decisions of the Indian Claims Commission, and the Supreme Court decisions, that there was a legislative intent to create a cause of action in cases of this nature. There was a congressional intent to create a cause of action for aboriginal claims, there was a congressional intent to create a cause of action for claims where the Government's title was based on unfair treatment of the Indians or based on unconscionable and inadequate payments to the Indians.

The attempt on the part of the Department of Justice to have this legislative action repealed and the decision of the Court of Claims reversed—in the testimony that appeared before the Committee on Appropriations—is violative of the basic proposition that legislation, of this sort should be brought before the appropriate committee of the House, in this case, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. And, if we are going to change the rules in the middle of these Indian Claims Commission suits, we should change them only after open and forthright hearings before the appropriate committee, well knowing what the result of such change will be.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman has stated that from an examination of the act there is a clear legislative intent following the line of decisions to which he has referred. I am wondering if the gentleman has read the statement by the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], on page 106 of the hearings to which the gentleman has referred, in which Mr. ROONEY said this:

We most certainly should have an interest in it if it involves the figures to which you have referred.

Over the luncheon recess I have had an opportunity to do some checking and I am glad to find that I did not vote for this bill. I discussed it with some of the Members of Congress who were concerned with the bill back at that time, and they seemed to uniformly say that it was never contemplated that anything like this should be developing nor that the Government should buy back the country from the Indians.

It was never intended that the Indian lands would cover, when it comes to compensation, all the places through which they roamed.

Has the gentleman considered that in making his statement?

Mr. METCALF. It was that language in the testimony of Mr. Morton at that point in the record that gave me concern about the future of this Indian claims legislation.

Mr. BOW. Well, can the gentleman tell us the amount that might be recovered under the present legislation and the decision of the court in the Otoe case?

Mr. METCALF. I will yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] to answer that question.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Montana for this opportunity to participate in the discussion on a matter of vital importance to thousands of Indians across the face of this country. With specific reference to the point raised by my good friend, I would like to say that we have discussed at some length the interchange between Assistant Attorney General Morton and Chairman ROONEY of the Subcommittee on Appropriations which handles Justice Department appropriations. I can assure the gentleman, in the first place, that there has never been any decision, to my knowledge, and certainly the Otoe decision does not hold, that Indian people are entitled to be compensated for land over which they roamed at any time. The concept of Indian title does not at all involve the idea of roaming over the lands and thereby acquiring a compensable right with regard to those lands. The idea of Indian title means exclusive occupancy, exclusive possession as against white people and against other Indian tribes, and that is a much smaller portion of the land than would be involved in the remarks which Mr. Morton made to the committee.

Mr. BOW. Has the gentleman estimated the cost, if the Otoe decision stands, to the Federal Government?

Mr. EDMONDSON. If every acre of land claimed in the 852 claims on file before the Indian Claims Commission were compensated for at the same rate that the land in the Otoe decision was compensated for, which is approximately 50 cents an acre, we would have a total figure of approximately $650 million, which is a far cry from the $5 billion figure cited by the Attorney General.

May I say this further? The record indicates very clearly in the cases already handled by the Indian Claims Commission that the percentage of recovery on the claims which have been asserted has been approximately 1.5 percent. If we apply to the estimated total value of claims which have been asserted and take into account all of the duplicating claims on which the same tribes are claiming the same land, which obviously is an impossibility under the concept of Indian title, as I understand it, if we allowed a 1.5 percent recovery on every acre of those lands to every tribe claiming them, it is my personal estimate based upon the recovery figure of the Indian Claims Commission that your total figure would be somewhere between $135 million and $150 million. That is my personal estimate.

I do not know that it has any greater weight than the estimate of the Assistant Attorney General, but it is based upon the experience of the Indian Claims Commission in dealing with these cases. I do not believe that Mr. Morton's estimate is based upon anything other than an ill-founded guess as to the probable outcome, and it is certainly a gross exaggeration when we consider it is more than 30 times as much as the Indian Claims Commission's experience would indicate.

Mr. BOW. I am delighted to have the gentleman's explanation, as a member of the subcommittee before whom the Assistant Attorney General Morton appeared. What does the gentleman have to say about the fact that there are now pending claims before the Commission for more than 1,320 million acres of land compared to the total of 1,900 million acres throughout the entire United States? It is apparent from that that there is a claim being made for practically all of the land in the United States. Does the gentleman have some comment to make upon that subject?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would say, in the first place, that I think it represents about 600 million acres less than the total acreage, for one thing, when I personally believe that had the Indians claimed every acre over which they roamed they could have claimed every acre in the United States. But aside from that I ask the gentleman once again to consider the figures on recovery allowed in the Otoe case. The recovery was only 50 cents an acre on claims asserted.

Mr. BOW. Would the gentleman say that the figure of 1,320 million acres is a correct figure by the assistant attorney general?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think if you allow duplicating claims where the same tribes are claiming the same land it would probably be in that neighborhood. But obviously you cannot have 10 tribes collecting for the same parcel of land when you require the establishment of exclusive occupancy as a basis for Indian title.

Mr. BOW. If the gentleman will yield further, I was concerned also about the fact that in my own State of Ohio there are about 38 claims pending aggregating 117 million acres. In the entire area of the State of Ohio there are something in the neighborhood of 26 million acres. We have claims pending against 117 million acres when we have only about 26 million acres in the State. So that this has pyramided to the point where the committee is concerned about the possibility of $5 billion or even more in claims being made under this decision.

I appreciate the gentleman's bringing this to our attention because, as I say, our committee is quite concerned about this problem.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that we are concerned about the problem, too. If the gentleman will carefully examine the decision in the Otoe case he will discover that there are no new rules as to Indian title. There is no change in the basic law. At this point in the RECORD I would like to insert a brief as to what the Indian title was before the decision in the Otoe case, and the gentleman will see that there have been no new changes.

The provision respecting the elements which must be found to sustain an award based upon unrecognized original Indian title is based upon the standards prescribed by the courts, as recently summarized by the United States Supreme Court in the case of *United States* v. *Santa Fe Pacific Railroad* (314 U. S. 339, 345):

> If it were established as a fact that the lands in question were, or were included in, the ancestral home of the Walapais in the sense that they constituted definable territory occupied exclusively by the Walapais (as distinguished from lands wandered over by many tribes), then the Walapais had Indian title—

One of the classic statements of the nature and extent of use or occupancy required to prove original Indian title was given by the Court of Claims in the case of *The Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations* v. *United States* (34 C. Cls. 17, 51):

> In all cases there must have been * * * some mastery of the tribe over the soil to the exclusion of others, or the joint possession of two or more tribes such as gave to each something of a fixed habitation or use of the land as hunting ground to establish a title by occupancy.

And in the case of the *Fort Berthold Indians* v. *United States* (71 C. Cls. 308, 334), the Court of Claims further stated:

> The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that the Indians' claim of right of occupancy of lands is dependent upon actual and not constructive possession.

But in defining use or occupation or possession, reference has always been to standards of the Indians' own economy and culture, as stated by the United States Supreme Court in the case of *Mitchel* v. *United States* (9 Pet. (34 U. S.) 711, 746):

> Indian possession or occupation was considered with reference to their habits and modes of life; their hunting grounds were as much in their actual possession as the cleared fields of the whites; and their rights to its exclusive enjoyment in their own way and for their own purposes were as much respected, until they abandoned them, made a cession to the Government, or an authorized sale to individuals.

In the case of the *Pawnee Indian Tribe of Oklahoma* v. *the United States* (1 Ind. Cls. Comm. 230, 258–262), the Indian Claims Commission adopted the above standards for application under the Indian Claims Commission Act, stating:

> It is well settled that where a claim is based on original Indian title, occupancy of the claimant tribe to the exclusion of other tribes [is] necessary (pp. 258–259).

And the Commission further stated:

> It is true the jurisdictional provisions of the Indian Claims Commission Act are broader than those contained in prior acts of Congress authorizing the adjudication of Indian claims, but this does not permit the Commission to deviate from these requirements made by the Supreme Court, as to what is necessary to establish original Indian title in land (id. at p. 262).

The use of the phrase "original Indian title" in the proposed amendment is not intended to suggest any distinction between that phrase and equivalent phrases which have been used by the courts, such as "aboriginal Indian title," "Indian title," "Indian right of occupancy," "aboriginal use and occupancy," "immemorial use and occupancy," and so forth. The qualifying word "unrecognized" has been used, because, as the law now stands, where the Indians' title to

land has been recognized by the Government, factual proof of actual use and occupancy is not required.

The language of the proposed amendment, prescribing the measure of damages, adopts the rule which has been applied by the courts heretofore in unrecognized original Indian title cases. See *Alcea Band of Tillamooks* v. *United States* (115 C. Cls. 463 (reversed as to interest, 341 U. S. 48)), *Rogue River Tribe of Indians et al.* v. *United States* (116 C. Cls. 454, cert. den. 341 U. S. 902), *Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians* v. *The United States* (131 C. Cls. 593, cert. den. 350 U. S. 848). It expressly excludes any allowance of interest or any other increment as damages for delay in making payment, such as is normally allowed in computing just compensation. Therefore, as to claims based upon unrecognized original Indian title, there will be no liability upon the part of the Government to pay interest on the value of the land going back many years to the date when the Indians lost their interest in the land. Otherwise, the language of the amendment is intended to adopt the settled rules of valuation applied by the courts in determining just compensation. See *United States* v. *Miller* (317 U. S. 369), *Klamath Indians* v. *United States* (85 C. Cls. 451, affirmed 304 U. S. 119), *Shoshone Tribe of Indians* v. *United States* (85 C. Cls. 331, affirmed 304 U. S. 111).

Mr. BOW. If the gentleman will yield, does this open the door for the filing of additional cases that would not have been filed otherwise?

Mr. METCALF. The passage of the Indian Claims Commission Act did, as was said in the Otoe case, create a new cause of action that opened the door for the filing of additional cases.

But the rules under which Indian title is determined are unchanged. This overlap about which the gentleman is concerned and about which the gentleman from Oklahoma has talked will not be the basis for additional claims because they have to prove their Indian title under the same rules that were in existence before the passage of the act. Merely roaming over the land will not give them title.

Mr. BOW. Does this go back to the aboriginal title?

Mr. METCALF. The decision in the Otoe case demonstrated that Congress intended the Commission to have jurisdiction over claims arising out of original Indian title but such title had to be proved under established and recognized rules; mere roaming over the land did not give them title upon which to base a claim.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. With regard to this matter of the legislative intent, which is the matter Mr. Morton brought up to the Appropriations Committee, was not that particular aspect of the problem fully considered in cases before the United States Court of Claims?

Mr. EDMONDSON. If the gentleman will yield, I would like at this point, if I may, to call to the attention of the House the remarks on the floor at the time this bill was before the House back in 1946 of some of the men who were responsible for the legislation and some of the men who were responsible for the interpretation of the legislation at the time it was under consideration. In the first place, I would like to direct the attention of the gentleman to the remarks made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] at the very outset of the discussion on the Indian Claims Commission bill. He said this:

> I do not propose to go into the merits of the legislation. I will leave that to the members of the Committee on Indian Affairs. However, may I say that this matter of Indian claims, claims of Indian citizens against their Government should be settled once and for all.

Along that line, we had testimony thereafter on the floor of the House by the different people associated with the bill, one after another of them stating that it was intended under this bill to take care of all of the claims of the Indian people. The gentleman from North Dakota, Mr. Robertson, who was a member of the committee at that time, called attention to a finding by the Select Committee on Indian Affairs to investigate Indian affairs under House Resolution 166 in the 78th Congress wherein they pointed out that—

> Indian claims of varying degrees of legality, morality, and merit remain outstanding against the Government in the aggregate sum of many hundreds of millions of dollars. Some of these claims are of unquestioned merit; others are highly questionable.

He goes on to point out that it is imperative that we take them all up in one forum and dispose of them.

Mr. Stigler, from Oklahoma, the late Bill Stigler, who was my distinguished predecessor in the House and one of the authors of this legislation, pointed this out:

> This bill creates a commission of three, appointed by the President subject to confirmation of the Senate, to hear and determine all claims of every nature whatsoever against the United States on behalf of any Indian tribe, band, or other identifiable group of American Indians residing within the territorial limits of the United States or Alaska.

The gentleman from South Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, had a similar statement in the RECORD. He said:

> Until and unless the Congress takes action to dispose of these claims, it simply means that these annual appropriations for the Indian Service and the Indian Bureau and for the bureaucrats who run them are going to have to be made, and the Indians will stay on their reservations, and we will get no place steadily in promoting the real interest and advancement of the Indian.

The Congressman from Washington, Mr. JACKSON, made this statement:

> Since 1928 when at the suggestion, I believe, of President Hoover, a comprehensive study was made by the Brookings Institution of our Indian administration, every group, private or public, that has studied this Indian problem has come to the conclusion that there ought to be a prompt and final settlement of all claims between the Government and its Indian citizens, and that the best way to accomplish this purpose is to set up temporarily an Indian Claims Commission which will sift all these claims, subject to appropriate judicial review, and bring them to a conclusion once and for all. That, in brief, is what H. R. 4497 seeks to accomplish.

Now that was the chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee in the House.

Then we have the Senator from the State of Washington who stated that the purpose of this bill was to consider all of these claims.

What we are objecting to is the action on the part of the Department of Justice through the Assistant Attorney General in coming in the back door and by means of a rider on an appropriation bill substantially reducing the rights of the American Indians without giving them a public hearing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, with respect to this matter of the Indian Claims Commission law, the Department of Justice attorneys have known for more than 10 years now that all the lawyers who were representing the Indians were filing claims all over the country in behalf of the Indians for their aboriginal rights. They knew that the Indians were going to great expense in gathering evidence on their claims. They knew that through all these years. I think it comes with poor grace on the part of the Department of Justice attorneys to wait until they had lost their case and then come in here at this late date trying to get an amendment through the Appropriations Committee. If they thought the law needed clarification, and if they did not agree with the attorneys who were filing these suits that there was a cause of action, they should have come here before the proper committee to try to clarify the matter. I think it is just a case of their asking for more money from the Committee on Appropriations, and, in order to justify it, they brought in this big case and made quite a to do about it. The committee was no doubt surprised at the fantastic figures cited as the probable cost of recovery. When they were asked about it by the committee, they glibly said, "Yes; we can suggest language to take care of the situation." They know, or ought to know, that it is not the province of the Appropriations Committee to amend or repeal substantive law.

Mr. UDALL. I quite agree with my colleague, and I intended to comment on that point.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida who is chairman of the subcommittee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HALEY. I agree with the statement made by the distinguished gentle-

man from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] who just preceded me. I think that the gentleman from the Justice Department was merely trying to justify additional appropriations. I think he has become alarmed over something here without studying the thing, and even if the figures that he has submitted here—which I think are all out of proportion—even if they were correct and that were true, does not the gentleman believe that all Indians as well as any other Americans have a perfect right to come into a court of competent jurisdiction and have their day in court?

Mr. UDALL. I agree entirely with the chairman of our committee.

I might say that this Indian Claims Commission Act, which was passed 10 years ago, has been called by students of history one of the highest acts of conscience of any civilized country having aboriginal people who once occupied the land and were pushed aside. I would say to my colleagues, the gentlemen from Oklahoma and Montana, and the others from Indian States who have participated in this discussion that the Indian Claims Commission Act has come to be a symbol of the sincerity of our Government in its dealings with our Indian citizens. In fact, I believe those of us from the Indian States feel that until such time as these claims are settled once and for all, our Indian people will tend to look backward at their grievances and we will have a hard time getting them to look on ahead to the future and assume their responsibilities. It is my further belief that the action of the Department of Justice is properly regarded by the Indians as a hostile act by the Eisenhower administration. I know it is so regarded by the Indian tribes in my own State.

Let me give you for a moment the actions of the present Department of Justice in the handling of Indian Claims Commission cases. I have followed their efforts perhaps closer than anyone in the Congress because my State has more Indians under trusteeship than any other in the country—I have 12 tribes comprising approximately 80,000 Indians. Although this act has been in effect for 10 years not a single case by any of the tribes of my State has been adjudicated. Also, largely due to the fault of the Department of Justice, very few cases have been disposed of during the 10-year life of this act. One of the principal reasons for this is the fact that the Department has adopted a policy of refusing to compromise cases out of court. There is a rather curious aspect about this policy.

One division of the Justice Department—the Antitrust Division—has been boasting lately that practically all of its cases are being settled out of court on a consent decree basis. There are no trials, but this division is dealing with litigants who are big-business combines. On the other hand where Indians litigants are concerned this other arm of Justice has adopted a flat policy of no out-of-court compromises or settlements. To me that is a harsh and unrealistic policy, and I do not think it reflects credit on the Government of the United States. In addition, these attorneys have refused in these Indian clams cases to stipulate to facts which might bring the cases to issue in a hurry. It has been obvious all along that Justice has an inadequate staff to handle these cases. Now, finally, after 3 years, they have come in and asked for an additional appropriation of $300,000 to get the staff they need to process these cases.

This Division of the Department of Justice had the unique distinction of being cited by the Hoover Commission on Legal Services and Procedures for its delays and inadequacies in pursuing under proper legal procedures the matters which it is to handle.

So I think the Congress should take note of this particular Division of the Department of Justice. I think it is high time that its activities and failings are called to the attention of the Members of this body.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Does not the gentleman agree with me also that it comes with rather poor grace from the Department which is supposed to be fighting for and contending for the rights of minority groups, as established by the courts, to go in the back door of an Appropriations Committee and seek to reduce and to diminish those rights for a substantial minority in our country by that back door, "no public hearing" approach, when those rights have been established and are substantial, as far as the Indian people are concerned?

Mr. UDALL. I agree with the gentleman. I think the Indians of my State take that view of it also.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. Does not the gentleman agree that we are not buying 1 foot of this land over again, when the original consideration for the land was determined by the Court to be so inadequate as to be a violation of the treaty?

Mr. UDALL. I do not think we are. Nor do I think that Congress intended that we should rebuy any Indian lands.

Mr. METCALF. Had they purchased the land for a proper consideration originally there would be no basis for a claim.

Mr. UDALL. That is true.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. I congratulate the gentleman upon his very fine statement, and state that in my own State two of the great civilized tribes, the Choctaws and the Chickasaws, won a case in which they won a judgment for several million dollars. The policy that is now being pursued would preclude other Indian tribes from having exactly the same kind of treatment that was given to those tribes through the Indian Claims Act. Is that not true?

Mr. UDALL. That is quite true. It would place that particular tribe of Indians in a preferential category, and deny other Indians the same rights granted to those tribes.

Mr. ALBERT. And in the case of the Choctaws and the Chickasaws, as any other tribe, if they have another claim of equal merit they would be in the position of not being able to get an adjudication of their claims under the same precedent under which they have previously obtained what they considered to be a fair price for land that had been taken from them for inadequate consideration.

Mr. UDALL. That is true also.

Mr. ALBERT. I would like to say to the gentleman, in addition to what my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] said about minority races and the interest of the Department of Justice in minority groups, it so happens that the Indians are wards of the Federal Government and here you find the legal arm of the Government taking action against a group of people under its own wardship. Is that not true?

Mr. UDALL. I think the Indians could very properly conclude, as the gentleman has suggested, that the Government has abused its trust duties.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. BROWNSON. It worries me a little about the legal implications of what the distinguished gentleman said about the problem of which we are all aware.

I wonder if we start renegotiating the acquisition price of all these lands all over the country just where that will lead if allowed to go to its ultimate extreme. As I remember we paid only $24 for the island of Manhattan. Is it the gentleman's logic that we should renegotiate everything, every land purchase from the Indians?

Mr. UDALL. I think if the gentleman would see this problem in its proper light he would realize there is not any claim pending for the island of Manhattan at the present time. And even if there were such a claim the price would be as of the time of taking and not the present-day price.

But many of these Indians out in the West have never been compensated at all for the lands which were taken from them, or they were compensated at rates which could only be considered as unconscionable.

Mr. BROWNSON. One further observation, if the gentleman will permit: We have had a great many years in which to negotiate these particular problems, at least 22 in which the gentleman's party was in power, and apparently they did not take any interest in it during that period of time.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to say with reference to what the gentleman just said that it was under the previous administration that the Indian Claims Commission Act was passed whereby our people achieved some justice in these cases.

The gentleman might also be interested to know that the States which have these claims pending include 28 of the 48 States. Some people would be surprised to know that there are 11 Indian groups in the State of Indiana that have claims filed before the Indian Claims

Commission; 21 in the State of Kansas; 59 in the State of Michigan; 15 in the State of Minnesota; 15 in the State of Nebraska; 33 in the State of New York; and 11 in the State of Wisconsin.

These claims are carried throughout the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at the conclusion of the gentleman's remarks a list of States in which such claims are pending at the present time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. It will take me but a very brief time to complete my statement. I will yield to the gentleman then.

Mr. Speaker, having lost those cases in the Court of Claims—and the Supreme Court having declined to take the cases—what did Mr. Morton, the gentleman in charge of this Division of the Department of Justice, proceed to do? He first threw out these "scare figures" that the Indian Claims Commission Act was going to cost many, many billions of dollars in his annual report last January.

He did not come back to the committee that originally handled this legislation—the committee which was considering, and is now considering, the extension of this act—but approached a committee which has never considered this legislation before and could very readily be misled. He then made to this committee his misleading assertions about the high cost of this legislation. He attempted to get a rider attached to an appropriation bill to amend the Indian Claims Commission Act.

So there we have the posture of this whole matter at the present time. We find the Eisenhower administration and its Department of Justice attempting, as I say, to cut the very heart out of the Indian Claims Commission Act. As far as the Indian tribes of America are concerned, if the aboriginal title provision of the Indian Claims Act is stricken, the central purpose of the act will be eliminated.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I should like to call the gentleman's attention to a number of statements that have been made charging the present administration with not being fair to minority groups. I think the record ought to be straight on this matter. The fact is that at the time of passage of this legislation by the Congress the then Attorney General, who was of the gentleman's party and not an appointee of this administration, opposed the passage of this legislation. The facts about that will be found on page 107 of the hearings of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Then again may I say to the gentleman that the Comptroller General during the previous administration, when this law was enacted, also opposed this legislation.

I should also like to add that at the time this bill passed the Congress, which would have made possible compensation based upon Indian title, President Truman vetoed it. Let us keep the record straight. In the previous administration there were objections filed by the then Attorney General, by the Comptroller General, and President Truman vetoed a bill which would have permitted this.

Mr. UDALL. I am well aware of the facts the gentleman sets forth, and they are facts; but the truth of the matter is that notwithstanding those objections the Congress went ahead and enacted the Indian Claims Commission Act and made it possible for the Indians to present their claims. It is my position that any change in that act now should be accomplished by the Congress through its appropriate committees.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. So that we may have this in the RECORD, I would like to say to the gentlemen from the Justice Department that if they think legislation of this kind is necessary, I hope they will recommend it so that it may go to the appropriate committee of the Congress. If they will request it—I do not say I will support their request—I will be very glad to introduce such legislation so that there may be public hearings and the matter given proper consideration by the proper committee.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman is willing to see that full hearings are had, and a full presentation made on this issue by both sides as to whether the Indian Claims Act should be changed?

Mr. HALEY. That is correct.

Mr. UDALL. I think the gentleman should be commended for his generous spirit. In my opinion, the jurisdiction to change this very important piece of legislation rests with his committee and I hope if any action is taken that it will be taken by that committee.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted by the Oklahoma delegation in the House and Senate at a meeting held on yesterday, March 27, 1956, on this subject wherein they request that the Attorney General submit any proposal for changes in the Indian Claims Act in the form of proposed legislation on which public hearings can be held in order that the Indian people may have their day in court before these committees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

RESOLUTION OF THE OKLAHOMA DELEGATION, MARCH 27, 1956

Whereas information has reached members of the delegation that an Assistant Attorney General has been seeking substantial amendment of the Indian Claims Commission Act by presentations before an appropriations subcommittee of the House, and in executive session before a Senate subcommittee; and

Whereas the Indians of Oklahoma have been seeking justice under the Indian Claims Commission Act since 1946, in accordance with court decisions interpreting that act; and

Whereas the proposed change in the law supported by the Assistant Attorney General would materially and substantially reduce and diminish the rights of many Oklahoma Indians under the Indian Claims Commission Act, without affording them any opportunity to be heard on the proposal in open hearings before congressional committees: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oklahoma delegation in the House and the Senate of the United States, That we respectfully request that the Attorney General of the United States submit any proposal for changes in the Indian Claims Commission Act in the form of proposed legislation, on which open public hearings will be held by the appropriate committees of the Senate and the House, in order that the Indian people may have their day in court before these committees, and an opportunity to be heard fully before any change is voted by Congress in the Indian Claims Commission Act, and the chairman of the Oklahoma delegation is hereby instructed to inform the Attorney General of the United States of the contents of this resolution.

Indian Claims Commission: Number of claims filed (852) by States of claimants

Alabama-Florida-Mississippi	3
Alaska	17
Arizona	42
Arizona-California	19
Arizona-Colorado-New Mexico-Utah	17
Arizona-Nevada-Utah	1
Arizona-New Mexico	12
Arizona-New Mexico-Oklahoma	2
California	11
California-Nevada	3
Colorado	1
Colorado-Utah	2
Connecticut	1
Florida	4
Florida-Mississippi	1
Idaho	1
Idaho-Montana	1
Idaho-Nevada-Utah-Wyoming	12
Idaho-Washington	3
Idaho-Washington-Oregon	2
Idaho-Wyoming	5
Indiana	11
Iowa-Kansas-Nebraska-Oklahoma	36
Iowa-Kansas-Oklahoma	6
Iowa-Oklahoma	19
Kansas	21
Kansas-Nebraska	3
Kansas-Nebraska-Oklahoma	1
Kansas-Oklahoma	15
Michigan	59
Minnesota	15
Minnesota-North Dakota	4
Minnesota-Wisconsin	11
Mississippi	2
Montana	23
Montana-Oklahoma	3
Montana-Wyoming	12
Nebraska	13
Nebraska-South Dakota	2
Nevada	2
New Mexico	19
New York	33
New York-Oklahoma	3
New York-Oklahoma-Wisconsin	10
North Carolina	3
North Dakota	10
North Dakota-South Dakota	1
Oklahoma	264
Oklahoma-New York-Wisconsin	3
Oregon	14
South Dakota	9
Utah	2
Washington	49
Wisconsin	11
Wyoming	3

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like also to call to the attention

of the Members of the House the substantial facts in controversy in the Otoe case which were decided with regard to the land involved in that particular decision.

The third cause of action on which they secured a judgment for $554,000 in the Otoe decision dealt with 792,000 acres which were held under Indian title for which the Indians had been paid by the Government a total of 4.9 cents per acre for land which was found actually to be worth at that time at least 75 cents an acre.

If the position taken by the Attorney General were to be sustained and were to be written into law at this time, we would in effect ratify the purchase by the Government of these 700,000 acres of land for about 5 cents an acre when that land was actually worth 75 cents an acre at that time.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has done a generous and a splendid thing in setting up legislation whereby we can review some of these transactions to see that justice is done where there are tribes to present claims by that kind of action. To undo the good work which we have done in this field would certainly be a step backward insofar as rehabilitation of our Indian people is concerned. One of the major reasons holding together tribes on reservations today is the fact that they think they will have their claims against the Government adjudicated. If we deprive them of their right to have some of those claims adjudicated at this time we are going to slow down and retard the business of getting them off of reservations and into a useful place in society as citizens should be in this society.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will not take this backward step. I hope the gentleman on the left side here will join us in preventing this from coming to pass through a rider on an appropriation bill.

WHAT ARE THE ANSWERS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the other day it was reported that another explosion of atomic bomb intensity had taken place within Soviet Russia. Further, that it was the first in a possible resumption of nuclear tests series.

Mr. Speaker, this news was preceded by a bigger bomb of world surprise proportions which allegedly exploded at the recent secret party congress held in Moscow; its shattering effects being pieced together in dispatches in the western press and its repercussions and reverberations will be watched very closely.

More specifically, the new look, the attendant circumstances leading up to what appears may be a most momentous decision not only upon the people within the confines of the vast territory terrorized by direct Soviet rule but also the possible resulting effect upon people and governments outside of the Iron Curtain.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, my speech today is directed toward remarks attributed to Nikita Khrushchev, Secretary General of the Communist Party, announcing that Dictator Stalin was a very bad man, that he perpetrated multitudes of crimes and murders, made many blunders, and therefore should be condemned rather than continued on the high pedestal of adoration, albeit he, Khrushchev, and each of his comrades at the secret conclave contributed much and were accessories and accomplices along the bloody road to their sanctified Kremlin.

Watching developments since Stalin's demise and endeavoring to interpret them, it is my conclusion that the announcement by Khrushchev, who deposed Malenkov and saw to it that Beria was liquidated and others purged, was a most bitter pill for him to swallow. Why? Because it revealed the defeat of his own drive and intention to be the single successor to Stalin of Georgia—to step into his high boots of unquestioned authority. Time was not of sufficient length prior to the secret party meeting to remove all of the obstacles and, therefore, with the votes of those who attended with him, which votes or nods were not yet controlled by him, the decision could not be a unanimous one of autocratic authority for the Secretary General but a determination that the others in attendance continue to have a part in the over-all, finalized decrees.

To assure, as much as such was possible, that Khrushchev would not become a second Stalin, the mold had to be destroyed and a collective control confirmed by blasting the sanguine deeds of the heretofore Communist ideal.

Naturally, each of us now speculates as to the possibilities—we took hope from the Geneva Conference—there appeared a new tactic—smiles—friendly overtures—but, Mr. Speaker, the deeds which speak loudest are still forthcoming. How far will this new leadership group go? Will they admit that the survivors of Stalin's rule—they who escaped immediate death—will be freed from slavery, from work camps, from Siberia, if you please, because they wrongly and unjustifiably were placed there by whim, caprice, or order of Stalin.

Will the collective leadership now say that the Katyn massacre of Polish officers and men was Stalin's direct order? Will they now take different views on agriculture which has been a basis for much difficulty since the plots of land reserved for use of those who work the land have been constantly diminished? Will the people in the satellite countries be given an opportunity to vote as to whether they want to remain under the present administrators or whether they now would like to be under the leadership of the new regime?

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion there is no criterion on which we can make other than hopeful expectations, since the entire Soviet setup is different from other governments outside their aggrandized limits. I mean this, particularly, which has been the basis of some government overthrows in South America; the army would spearhead an uprising or revolution. I do not expect such an event in the U. S. S. R. since the army again through purges has been Sovietized to a very large extent in contrast to the people within the Soviet orbit, be they peasants or other civilians.

Mr. Speaker, there are many questions to which we await answers now that allegedly there has been some change.

We must wait and watch. There may even be some more colds among other administrators who will be sent to Moscow for special treatment, such as we had in the case of Mr. Beirut who was the man in charge in Poland, who contracted a cold while he was in Moscow during the congress there, was given some specialized medical treatment and sent back to Poland in a casket.

Mr. Speaker, this is the Easter time. We shall be adjourning tomorrow out of respect for that great holiday, that great observance, the salvation of mankind. We must keep strong in faith and defense and hope, as we wait and watch whether the surprise bomb, as I referred to it at the outset, will mean a lessening of the threat of communism or, forbid, an intensification.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. CRETELLA. I would like to commend my colleague from Connecticut on an excellent presentation of a subject in which he has shown deep and enthusiastic interest. I should like to congratulate him on the presentation.

Mr. SADLAK. I am delighted to have that observation from my distinguished colleague from the third district. I know how closely he, too, is watching these newest developments.

A NEW LOBBY TO WEAKEN THE FLAMMABLE FABRICS ACT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a new lobby has been born. It is part Japanese and it is part American. Its purpose is to weaken the Flammable Fabrics Act of 1954 so as to permit the importation and sale in the United States of certain lightweight silk scarfs manufactured in Japan which now cannot meet the act's safety tests developed after years of study and experimentation.

This new lobby reportedly is determined to work on the executive establishment, Members of Congress, and management and labor organizations, because certain Japanese manufacturers do not wish to treat their products for fire retardance and also because millions of dollars of such dangerous scarfs are now in offsale storage or bonded warehouses, chiefly in the New York area, and such cannot be released for sale to the American public because of the Federal statute and a like New York State statute.

It will be recalled that the House last year rejected by a more than 2-to-1 vote a rule which would bring up for floor debate and action a bill permitting the importation and sale of such scarfs. This fact of life, however, has not deterred those who would destroy the Flammable Fabrics Act and it appears

now that the new lobby is reaching out to cover the waterfront in its program.

It is time that the women of America, through their clubs and organizations, the fire marshals, and fire chiefs of our land, and others who over the years crusaded to have written into the laws of our country a protective statute, should be alerted concerning this new threat.

I have been pleased to learn from a recent letter from the Honorable John W. Gwynne, distinguished Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, and a former respected Member of the House, that inspectors of the Commission have been diligently on their toes in enforcing the Flammable Fabrics Act. Chairman Gwynne advises that the Commission has issued formal complaints against a substantial number of New York scarf importers violating the laws and many thousands of such scarfs have been condemned.

Contrary to earlier Japanese statements that they have found no way to make their scarfs meet the flammability test of our law, Chairman Gwynne states that new imports have been shown to pass the test readily because of being properly treated before export. He writes:

As a result of Commission efforts and a growing consciousness on the part of importers, wholesalers, and retailers, of their responsibilities under the Flammable Fabrics Act, very few shipments of scarfs of questionable weight and material are being presented to customs authorities for entry into this country. However—

The Chairman goes on to say—

I am advised that many of our American importers still have sizable inventories of lightweight scarfs either in offsale storage or bonded warehouses. These stocks remain under close scrutiny of representatives of this agency as well as New York State authorities who also are administering a State flammable fabrics act of practically identical provisions as the Federal law. Before being offered for sale, the merchandise must necessarily be treated with a fire retardant process which may be applied either here or in some foreign market.

There is the story and because some importers do not want to meet the flammability tests of Federal and State law, the new lobby is moving in. I cannot believe that this House will retreat 1 inch in its evident determination to maintain and protect a law designed to prevent the killing and maiming of our people, so many of them women and children, as in yesteryear.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in my remarks a complete copy of Chairman Gwynne's letter to me, dated March 12, 1956:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN,
Washington, March 12, 1956.

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANFIELD: Thank you very much for your letter of March 2, 1956, relating to a bill presently before Congress to exempt from the provisions of the Flammable Fabrics Act scarfs which are made from plain surface materials. Your views in the matter are greatly appreciated.

In response to your request for information relating to the 1955 exports of Japanese silk scarfs to this country, the following is submitted:

During the latter part of 1954 it came to the attention of this agency that certain of the lightweight untreated silk scarfs being imported from Japan were questionable under the prescribed test for flammability set forth in the Flammable Fabrics Act. This information was immediately made known to the American scarf importers and they were generally advised that untreated silk habutae material less than 5 momme weight was questionable under the act and that the marketing of articles of wearing apparel made therefrom was unlawful.

Practically all importations of questionable Japanese silk scarfs entering this country during 1954 and the early part of 1955 involved shipments for which orders, accompanied by irrevocable letters of credit, were placed with Japanese exporters prior to the effective date of the Flammable Fabrics Act or at a time when it was generally thought throughout the trade that 4 momme silk habutae material would pass the prescribed test for flammability. As a result of these importations and the later sale of some of the scarfs contained therein, the Commission has issued formal complaints against a substantial number of New York scarf importers. During the same period libel proceedings were instituted by the Commission in the New York Federal District Court and approximately 88,000 silk scarfs of 3 momme weight were condemned.

Many of the lightweight scarfs imported into this country during 1954 and the early part of 1955 were treated for fire retardance before being marketed. In addition, I am advised that a large number of such scarfs have been returned by the importers to Japan or other foreign markets for further processing before sale.

Upon becoming aware of the questionable nature of untreated silk scarfs weighing less than 5 momme, the importing trade where possible converted orders which had already been placed but not delivered into ones for heavier weight silk or combination silk and rayon materials which safely pass the test for flammability. Likewise, most new orders, a large number of which were delivered during 1955, were for the heavier weight and combination silk and rayon materials. In addition, some of the 1955 entries were treated scarfs which readily passed the test for flammability.

As a result of Commission efforts and a growing consciousness on the part of importers, wholesalers, and retailers of their responsibilities under the Flammable Fabrics Act, very few shipments of scarfs of questionable weight and material are being presented to customs authorities for entry into this country. I am advised, however, that many of our American importers still have sizable inventories of lightweight scarfs either in offsale storage or bonded warehouses. These stocks remain under close scrutiny of representatives of this agency as well as New York State authorities who also are administering a State Flammable Fabrics Act of practically identical provisions as the Federal law. Before being offered for sale the merchandise must necessarily be treated with a fire retardant process which may be applied either here or in some foreign market.

I hope that the above will be helpful to you. However, if you desire more detailed information on the subject matter here involved, please let me know and I will have the chief of our division of wool, fur, and flammable fabrics call on you at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. GWYNNE,
Chairman.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes, I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from California, my good friend, who was one of the original sponsors of the Flammable Fabrics Act.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am very much interested in the statement the gentleman is making. As he knows, in 1944 I introduced the first bill of this kind that was ever presented to the Congress. It was really a draft of a bill that the fire marshal of California asked me to introduce, because we had a statute in California which effectively barred flammable fabrics manufactured in our State from being sold in California. Mr. Walter Jones, editor of the Sacramento Bee suggested to me that the real solution of the problem would be a national act prohibiting the manufacture of dangerous fabrics which would provide our people with security and safety on a nationwide basis.

In working on that bill the Bureau of Standards helped me. They conducted in my office the first test to determine what was the right type and speed of burning, as far as the time element was concerned, which would make a fabric safe for human use. A member from the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], was also present and viewed the test at the suggestion of Mr. Lea, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Later I personally investigated and found that a great many people, including children, had been burned by these dangerous fabrics. The gentleman is talking about these flammably dangerous scarves that ladies wear around their necks. I remember distinctly one case of a young lady at Texas University who was a member of a sorority, the same sorority to which my wife belonged in college. This young lady was going out to a party. She lighted a cigarette, and her scarf started to burn so rapidly that the poor girl was burned so badly that she died.

We were unable to accurately determine how many people had been injured by that kind of fabric, and whether they were fatal or not. The reason was that the insurance companies, who cheerfully gave us a great deal of data, did not record exactly how the injury occurred. They did not look into the question of the fabric involved, they merely ascertained that certain persons who were their policyholders had been burned and, therefore, the insurance policies had to be paid. They did not investigate the type of the burns.

I compliment the gentleman for raising this issue here in the House of Representatives today as we do not want the people desiring to change this law to go in the back door now that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has on the books this very effective law that outlaws this type of dangerous fabrics and gives protection to everyone who uses fabrics. I am very much pleased with what the gentleman is saying. I offer him my sincere gratitude for bringing this before the House.

Mr. CANFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his testimony. I know that he

is just as determined as I am that this act shall not be weakened or diluted in any way that may impair its effectiveness.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I must refer to one other matter, of which the gentleman who has been so gracious in yielding to me is aware which illustrates that the fabric industry both in the retail field as well as in the manufacturing field are aware of the benefits of a strong fabric law and opposed to it being weakened.

Since I had been interested and appeared before committees on the problem of outlawing dangerous fabrics, I became known to many in the industry who might be affected.

Among others was the president of the Penney Co. He invited me to their New York laboratory and illustrated to me how they were continuously testing fabrics for flammability, to be sure that no fabrics going into their products would be dangerous to persons using these fabrics as wearing apparel. They were anxious to help the enforcement agencies keep the law strong and safe against injury. The company was anxious to have Members of Congress know about their efforts.

Also in the Easter recess in 1945 I visited an office near Charlottesville, the specific name of which I cannot now remember. However, here I talked to a very interesting man who represented the cotton industry. He informed me that his group was doing research designed to learn the flammability of various fabrics, the purpose being to sell only those whose flammability was so low that no possible danger from fire could result from the wearing of these fabrics.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AMERICA FACES LOSS OF WORLD LEADERSHIP IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, as all of us here know, one of the most dangerous attitudes a person can have it overconfidence. I wonder how long it is going to take us to realize that overconfidence is exactly the attitude we have fallen into in the past few years. I wonder how many Americans realize that Russia may well be the world's leader in science and technology a decade from now. In fact, the Vice Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force stated on February 9 that the Russians not only are "making scientific and technological advances at a faster rate than we," but that they are presently "beating us at our own game" of mass production.

This statement is supported by some of their recent advances in scientific development. For example:

First. In June 1954 they completed a 5,000 kilowatt atomic reactor which produces commercial electric power.

Second. Last May the Russian Air Force revealed intercontinental jet bombers which compare favorably with any long-range bomber we have in production.

Third. They recently announced plans to construct an atomic-powered ice breaker and they may well have an atomic-powered surface craft completed before we do.

Fourth. According to some people who should know, the Russians expect to be in production on an intermediate range ballastic missile before the end of the year. And it should be common knowledge that a ballistic missile with a range of 1,500 miles will render our entire air defense system obsolete.

Fifth. The automation experts who visited Russia recently reported that the Soviets have completely automatic production lines which compare with the automated lines we have in this country.

Sixth. They have recently announced in their technical publications great advances in the field of electronic computers.

Seventh. Last summer at the Geneva Conference on Atomic Energy they reported that they are constructing a cyclotron which is bigger than any in the free world. We have no basis in fact to doubt their report.

Eighth. The Soviets have exploded hydrogen bomb devices. Soviet leaders boast that they really get a "bigger bang for a buck" with these bombs. They maintain that they use less of the costly materials involved to get results comparable to ours.

Ninth. The Russians have apparently progressed so far in the realm of nuclear technology that they can afford to share some of their reactors, fissionable material and technicians. They have made deals with both Rumania and Yugoslavia to furnish those countries with atomic reactors, the material to fire them and the technicians required for their installation and maintenance.

The United States has also made progress in these fields, but it has not been fast enough to maintain our position of scientific supremacy. How does it happen that a nation which only a few years ago was considered industrially primative can today challenge the leadership of the United States in atomic research and technology as well as in the sciences generally?

Well, let me recite some facts which may account for this alarming situation. The fault you will see lies in our own shortcomings.

AMERICAN SUPPLY OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS VERSUS DEMAND

Last year the American economy needed 35,000 additional engineers. Yet American colleges graduated only 23,000 engineers. This left a deficit of some 12,000.

This year, not counting the carryover demand from last year, it is estimated we will need 39,000 new engineers. Yet American colleges will produce only about 30,000. Thus, we will have a cumulative shortage during these 2 years of 21,000 engineers.

At the rate our annual technological requirements are increasing the shortage will be staggering by 1964. In that year, it is estimated that Government and industry will need 71,000 new engineers. Yet on the basis of current estimates, we will produce only 43,000 new engineers.

In total by 1964 we can expect the cumulative shortage to be some 166,000 new engineers alone. And that estimate merely assumes a continued industrial level of partial mobilization. What our shortage would be in the event of full mobilization is extremely disquieting to contemplate.

In some specific fields such as nuclear engineering the situation will be even worse than the figures indicate. Much the same picture prevails in the supply and demand of research scientists as well.

AMERICAN VERSUS RUSSIAN GRADUATION OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS

Mr. Speaker, if we compare Russian graduating classes with our own, we can easily see why they are gaining on us. The result is a colossal danger signal.

Five years ago we graduated nearly twice as many engineers as the Soviet Union. Two years ago the Soviets graduated more than twice as many as we did. And last year they produced nearly three times as many as we did.

At the moment we still have more engineers available to the Nation than the Soviet Union has, but our margin of leadership is getting smaller each year. If the present trend in both nations continues they will soon pass us.

QUALITY IS IMPORTANT TOO

The caliber of our scientists and engineers and the quality of American professional training is unsurpassed anywhere in the world. Still we cannot rest our hopes on that fact alone.

The quality of Soviet scientists and Soviet training, from a technical standpoint, is more than adequate for their needs. This fact was made amply apparent during their last May Day celebration and at the First International Conference on the Peacetime Uses of Atomic Energy, which took place at Geneva last year.

I had the opportunity of attending that atomic energy conference in Geneva. While I was there I had the opportunity of seeing some of their impressive progress. I made every effort to talk to as many scientists from the free nations of Europe as I could. Many of them had visited the Soviet Union and saw firsthand the products of Soviet scientists. The technical people I talked with in Geneva told me quite frankly that Soviet scientists, mathematicians, and engineers are as good as will be found anywhere. No one who attended that Conference went away in any mood to disparage the quality of Soviet scientists or their work.

At the Geneva Conference many American scientists were impressed with the high level of basic scientific and atomic

research accomplished by Soviet scientists. This research has no direct military use. It is, however, the key to leadership, first in the sciences and sooner or later in technology. In the past American leadership in this area was unquestioned. Today, however, the Soviets are gaining on us in basic research as well as in technology. This is largely due to the current critical shortage of people with advanced training in the theoretical areas of the sciences.

SOVIET EFFORTS TO DEVELOP TECHNICIANS

Getting to the heart of the matter, the scientists I spoke with at Geneva told me that the efforts of the Communist leaders to develop an elite corps of science and engineering students was amazingly successful. Potential scientists and engineers among Soviet boys and girls are sought out and encouraged from the very earliest grades. If Russian boys and girls decide to enter the sciences, substantial government scholarships and the highest honors of the Soviet society are theirs. The size of the graduating classes in Russia demonstrates how effective this program is.

Neither do the Russian leaders spare any expense in making the very latest and best research tools and laboratories as well as a plentiful supply of qualified science teachers available to Soviet students. Their grade schools and high schools as well as their colleges have a broad and intensive curriculum in mathematics and the sciences. Their young students receive instruction from the best scientists and engineers available. Whatever one may think of Communist instruction in Marxist hogwash, their results in the physical sciences are impressive.

AMERICAN EFFORTS TO DEVELOP TECHNICIANS

The Russian educational system contrasts greatly with ours. We have a long tradition of local financing and control of schools. This means that our students largely have a free choice of studies and of careers. For this we can be grateful. Under no circumstances would we want the Soviet type of regimentation and dictatorship in our schools.

Unfortunately, the contrast does not stop here. In the United States only half of the high-school graduates who are potential science and engineering students enter college. And, to make matters worse, less than half of those who embark on science and engineering studies finish their preparation for a career in science or engineering.

This, in the total picture, means that the United States is receiving the services of, roughly, only 2 out of every 10 boys and girls who are its potential scientific and engineering resources. The rest of that talent, through lack of guidance and encouragement, is being lost. This Nation can ill afford such extravagance.

Time and again history has demonstrated that a nation's most valuable resource is the ability, character, and training of its people. The nation which squanders the potentialities of its young men and women is courting national disaster. And that is exactly what is happening in the United States today.

Let us go back one step further and look at the college preparation of high-school boys and girls in this country today. In 1900 over half of our high-school students enrolled in algebra courses. Today less than a quarter do.

In 1900 a fifth of the students took geometry. Today about a tenth do.

Most startling of all is the decreasing enrollments in physics courses. In 1900 a fourth of all high-school students studied this basic physical science. Today about 4 percent do. Indeed, today less than half of the high schools even include the science of physics in their curriculum.

The problem of high-school curriculum is closely tied up with the availability of teachers. With a shortage of scientists and technicians in high-paying industrial fields, it is only natural that a shortage of high-school science and mathematics teachers should occur. The result is a thin watered-down scientific course in high schools.

It is small wonder, then, that college enrollments in the physical sciences and engineering have fallen off. Unless students become acquainted with mathematics, physics, and chemistry early in their careers, they can hardly be expected to select these fields for their lifework.

This, however, is only part of the reason for a decreasing supply of graduate engineers and scientists. There are some basic economic reasons why many boys and girls do not go to college. A college education is getting more expensive every year. The cost of books, housing, clothing, and food, not to mention tuition, has been going up yearly. The purchasing power of college scholarships is only a fraction of what it was a few years ago. This means that boys and girls without money find it impossible to work their way through and still get a decent education. The Nation, not the student, is the loser in this economic squeeze.

SUMMARY OF THE PROBLEM

The general pattern of this problem is clear. A shortage of teachers and a decreasing curriculum in the high schools means that fewer students get early training in the sciences and mathematics. The poorer college preparation of our students means that they have less interest or incentive to go on to professional studies in college, especially in light of the high cost of such an education. Thus we have fewer graduates in the face of an increasing demand.

This by no means tells the whole story, but the root causes of the present crisis stand out sharp and clear. I have tried to picture some of them here.

The seriousness of the crisis becomes clear when you consider the dire consequences of this shortage.

DANGER TO OUR NATIONAL SECURITY

First, let us not forget for a moment that any flaw in the Amercan economic machine weakens our potential for national defense. Our national security rests on our technological superiorities. Man for man, the free world is outnumbered many times over by the teeming population of the Soviet world. We in the free world have been forced to base our defense on the greater fire power, greater mobility, and long-range striking power of our fighting forces.

Until recently our weapons have been so far superior to those of our enemies they have not dared attack us. They have been constrained to weigh heavily the disastrous consequences of war to themselves whether they won or lost. Without a continuing and increasing contribution from our scientists and engineers to the national defense we will be in serious trouble. They must keep us out in front in the race for the ultimate weapon. In spite of this great need we do not have enough scientists and engineers working to keep a safe margin between us and the Soviet Union. It is cause for alarm that the Soviet Union has so greatly surpassed us in turning out scientists and technicians. They are surpassing us in a primary element of military and industrial strength.

It is impossible to separate advance in the field of atomic energy from advance in the other sciences and mathematics. They go hand in glove, for the one relies heavily on the other. A single problem requires coordinated attacks by many different kinds of specialists. This is the reason why we on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have become so concerned with the problem.

DANGER TO OUR STANDARD OF LIVING

Secondly, let us recall that one of the greatest factors in the phenomenal growth of the American standard of living in the last century and a half has been our science and technology. The application of technical know-how to our vast physical resources has helped make us the freest, wealthiest, and happiest Nation on earth. It has provided us with a firm base for fulfilling the promise of the American way of life.

If we are to continue the constructive work of our predecessors, we must realize that progress is not an accidental occurrence. It is the result of hard work and careful planning. American industry still has a big job to do. It must continually expand to satisfy the needs of an expanding population. It must tackle more difficult and more complex problems to find new and better ways of fulfilling its mission. All of this means that the normal need for scientific and engineering manpower grows greater each year we progress.

This is illustrated by the fact that in 1900 there was only 1 engineer for approximately every 290 workers in industrial fields. Today there is 1 engineer for every 65 such workers. We may one day progress to the point where there are more scientific and technical workers than there are production workers. A shortage of technologists today is clearly a threat to our industrial strength and standard of living in the years ahead.

ACTION BY CONGRESS IS REQUIRED

This situation is urgent, but little has been done. The National Science Foundation and the AEC as well as industry and professional associations are making attempts to recruit more technological workers, but this only treats a symptom, not the cause. In the face of the gravity of the problem and the apparent

inability of others to tackle it, Congress must assume leadership. This present session of Congress must initiate a crash program to prevent a steady decay in our economy and national defense. Should the present trends continue, we are certain to find ourselves sitting face to face with national tragedy in the near future.

As a first step we need to get more information. And we need to get suggested solutions from those who have already been working with the problem. Needless to say, a problem involving our national education system must be studied thoroughly. We dare not risk a remedy here which is worse than the ailment. However, hundreds of qualified people have been studying the problem for several years now. We want to bring out in the open the results of their research.

In order to lay the groundwork for this process, the Legislative Reference Service has prepared, at my request, an excellent summary of the material already available on the subject. As a result the problem areas which need our attention have been isolated.

As a second step, the Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is going to study this problem in open hearings. These hearings will be held as soon as circumstances permit. As chairman of that subcommittee, I invite every interested person who has something to contribute to join us in our study.

We plan to use the document prepared by the Legislative Reference Service as a jumping off point in our hearings. In order that this study may receive as wide a distribution as possible, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has had it printed as a committee document in preparation for the hearings. Copies of this study are being sent to every Member of Congress today. Additional copies may be obtained from the committee or from the Government Printing Office.

I am sure that every Member of Congress regardless of party or committee assignment will wish to participate in this important discussion and help formulate a positive program of Federal action in the coming weeks. It is certain that we cannot continue our present drifting without going on the rocks.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for his concern and for his serious study of our national shortcomings in the technological training of our people which are so essential to our national defense as well as for production and for the Government itself. His very carefully prepared report on this subject, which has been printed by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, should be required reading for every Member of Congress.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his kind remarks. I hope every Member of Congress will look over this study which will probably be on his desk tomorrow. He will find in it much food for thought. It will be helpful to him in his consideration of the problem. I know there are many Members of the House who are deeply interested.

WHY NO LABOR LEGISLATION?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will begin its regular 10-day Easter recess tomorrow.

I suggest to my colleagues that this absence from Washington gives us an excellent opportunity to review this session's legislative progress. It also gives us the opportunity to resolve to increase our rate of progress after our return if we desire to do so.

Certainly that objective is of substantial importance since we will obviously desire to end this session in time for the national political conventions. This will reduce the period of time which might otherwise be available by extending the session for considering and adopting useful legislation.

Each one of us is aware that this is an election year.

But all of us are obliged to recognize that this is a legislative year as well. I am quite sure that our constituents will judge us in November against the standard of whether we discharge our legislative duties in meeting the session's issues and not against the standard of how successfully vital issues have been avoided for reasons of political self-protection.

Each of us in this Chamber shares a measure of responsibility to see to it that needed legislation is promptly enacted.

The major responsibility, in this connection, lies quite obviously with the Democrat Party which, as the majority party, controls the congressional committees and elects the committee chairmen, who in turn determine what legislation, if any, will be considered.

I wonder if the Democrat Party's campaign spokesmen will admit to this responsibility a few short months from now?

I think the answer to this question will be of great interest to substantial groups of our citizens.

I should imagine the answer to this question will be of particular importance to our American working men and women and their unions, since the Democrat Party has consistently advertised itself as being completely devoted to their interest.

The extent of this devotion—if legislative activity in this Congress upon proposals which seem to have some bearing on the American worker's welfare is any measure—would seem to be more a matter of lip-service than of heart-felt regard.

This matter has aroused increased public interest in recent weeks, thanks to the interest of men who really want to get something accomplished for the benefit of American wage earners.

Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, who is charged by act of Congress with the duty of fostering the American wage earner's welfare, has publicly expressed his concern that the appropriate congressional committees are disregarding the administration's proposals which are intended to benefit America's working men and women. Secretary Mitchell has expresesd the earnest hope that these proposals will at least receive consideration.

Here, it seemed to me, was an opportunity to compare the amount of interest the Republican Party and the Democrat Party have displayed so far by their support of Federal legislative proposals of benefit to the American workers. I, therefore, made some inquiries.

The results are amazing, when it is considered that 7 of the proposals I will describe to you are estimated to affect approximately 43 million American working men and women. That is a lot of people.

Republican Members of this House introduced nine bills which embodied proposals of interest to the Department of Labor in the first session. President Eisenhower specifically referred to some of these proposals in various of his messages to the Congress, and the Bureau of the Budget cleared each of them prior to its introduction so that they all can be considered in accord with the President's program.

The status of these proposals follows:

I. A BILL TO AMEND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

This bill was introduced in the Senate—S. 1163—and in the House—H. R. 4312—on February 23, 1955.

President Eisenhower recommended the adoption of 2 of its 3 proposed amendments in his January 20, 1955, Economic Report. These were that all eligible claimants be entitled to receive unemployment compensation benefits for a maximum period of 26 weeks if they are unemployed that long, and that a uniform period of 6 weeks during which benefits will be postponed on disqualification be established, while providing for only 1 type of disqualification for the same act. The third proposal tightens the wage-qualifying requirements.

It is estimated that this proposal will benefit approximately 225,000 working men and women.

The House District Committee has taken no action upon this proposal since its introduction 1 year ago.

II. A BILL TO AMEND TITLE IV OF THE VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

This bill was introduced in the Senate—S. 1418—on March 14, 1955, and in the House—H. R. 4946—on March 15, 1955.

It amends the act to provide that an ex-serviceman shall not be eligible for the special unemployment compensation benefits of the act for more than 3 years after his discharge or the effective date of the amendment, whichever is later, except where he has pursued education and training or vocational rehabilitation programs provided by the act.

The House Veterans' Affairs Committee acted most promptly on this proposal, and I am happy to report that it was

enacted into law—Public Law 176—with President Eisenhower's signing of the measure on July 26, 1955.

III. A BILL TO PROVIDE FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID TO THOSE STATES WHICH ESTABLISH AN APPROVED PLAN FOR A PROGRAM OF INDUSTRIAL SAFETY

This bill was introduced in the Senate—S. 1091—on February 18, 1955, and in the House—H. R. 5740—on April 20, 1955.

The purpose of the bill is to encourage the States to develop industrial safety programs in order that they may adequately combat industrial accidents which result in injury, death, excessive financial loss, and uncomputable misery. Thus, in 1955 alone, industrial accidents caused 15,000 deaths, about 76,800 workers suffered some kind of permanent physical impairment, and more than 1,839,000 received injuries which disabled them for 1 day. The estimated direct and indirect cost of these accidents is almost $3½ billion.

It is estimated that this proposal will benefit approximately 39 million working men and women.

The Department of Labor voluntarily transmitted its report to the House Education and Labor Committee on May 30, 1955. This committee has taken no action upon the proposal since its introduction 11 months ago.

IV. A BILL TO ESTABLISH STANDARDS FOR HOURS OF WORK AND OVERTIME PAY OF LABORERS AND MECHANICS EMPLOYED ON WORK DONE UNDER CONTRACT FOR, OR WITH THE FINANCIAL AID OF, THE UNITED STATES, FOR ANY TERRITORY, OR FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

This bill was introduced in the Senate—S. 1204—on February 25, 1955, and in the House—H. R. 5758—on April 20, 1955.

It proposes to revise, modify, and codify the vast series of complicated and overlapping statutes, dating back to 1892, which govern the hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on public work by the Federal Government and its contractors and subcontractors. It will, for example, eliminate such ambiguities as whether the law gives an employee who works overtime the right to collect time and one-half compensation if his employer fails to pay it. It also proposes to amend the existing overtime provisions which, as an example, presently permit certain contractors to perform Federal work with laborers and mechanics who work 56 hours a week without receiving overtime compensation even though Congress has established a straight-time workweek of 40 hours for Federal employment, for work connected with interstate commerce under the wage and hour law, and for work on Federal supply contracts under the Walsh-Healey Act.

It is estimated that this proposal will benefit approximately 1 million working men and women.

The House Education and Labor Committee has taken no action upon this proposal since its introduction 11 months ago.

V. A BILL TO AMEND THE LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT TO AUTHORIZE MORE EFFECTIVE USE OF THE SPECIAL FUND PROVIDED FOR IN SECTION 44

This bill was introduced in the Senate—S. 1308—on March 4, 1955, and in the House—H. R. 5759—on April 20, 1955.

The existing measure, aside from being the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, is also the basic workmen's compensation law for the District of Columbia and its compensation rate is the measure for compensation paid by the Federal Government under the War Hazards Act. The act's total coverage, as extended, is estimated to total between 500,000 and 600,000 employees.

The section 44 special fund, which derives from collected fines and penalties and amounts paid by employers in the stevedoring industry covered by the act has an average annual income of approximately $35,000 and an average annual disbursement of approximately $10,000; the fund presently totals about $734,522. Experience indicates that the fund is capable of supporting certain presently unprovided worthwhile and necessary services for its beneficiaries.

The draft legislation proposes to establish a priority for payments from the entire fund for permanent total disability resulting from the combined effect of two injuries, to increase the amount of the maximum allowance for maintenance of employees undergoing vocational rehabilitation from $10 to $25 per week, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to use the fund for furnishing prosthetic appliances or other apparatus to refit an injured employee for employment, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to procure rehabilitation services in cases where necessary services are not otherwise available through existing facilities, and to authorize the payment of awards to provide relief to employees who are unable to collect compensation awards because of the insolvency of their employers or their deceased employers' estates.

It is estimated that this proposal will benefit approximately 650,000 working men and women.

I wish to note for the record that the House Education and Labor Committee's Subcommittee on Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act began hearings on S. 2280 and pending House bills on March 12, 1956.

VI. A BILL TO AMEND THE LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' ACT, AS AMENDED, TO PROVIDE INCREASED BENEFITS IN CASE OF DISABLING INJURIES

This bill was introduced in the Senate—S. 1307—on March 4, 1955, and in the House—H. R. 5757—on April 20, 1955.

This act, which I just mentioned as being also the basic workmen's compensation law for the District of Columbia and whose rate is the measure of compensation paid by the Federal Government under the so-called War Hazards Act, specifies that benefits shall be paid at 66⅔ percent of the employee's average weekly wage, with a maximum dollar limit of $35 a week. This weekly sum aggregates only $1,820 when extended on an annual basis; this benefit limit therefore prevents the percentage from operating in the case of wage earners whose wages exceed the dollar maximum. Thus, as the level of wages rises, the compensation which is received sinks far below the two-thirds of the employee's wages intended by the law.

These weekly compensation limits were set in 1948 in relation to the prevailing wage rate in the industry and the then prevailing cost of living, and their continuance under today's economic conditions is obviously unrealistic.

It is estimated that this proposal will benefit approximately 650,000 working men and women.

I wish to note for the record that the House Education and Labor Committee's Subcommittee on Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act began hearings on this and allied measures on March 12, 1956.

VII. A BILL TO INCLUDE PERSONS ENGAGED IN CARRYING OUT THE PROVISIONS OF LABOR LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES WITHIN THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 111 AND 1114 OF TITLE 18 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO ASSAULTS AND HOMICIDES

This bill was introduced in the Senate—S. 1150—on February 21, 1955, and in the House—H. R. 6997—on June 23, 1955.

The bill proposes to provide protection to Department of Labor officers and employees who are engaged in the administration and enforcement of Federal labor laws, as similarly engaged officers in other Federal activities are now protected. The protection results from the deterrent effect of designating these acts as Federal crimes.

The House Judiciary Committee has not considered this bill to date, although the Department of Labor transmitted its report on July 13, 1955.

VIII. A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT BY PROVIDING FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENDITURES FROM THE EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION FUND BY FEDERAL EMPLOYING AGENCIES

This bill was introduced in the Senate—S. 1309—on March 4, 1955, and in the House—H. R. 5751—on April 20, 1955.

This bill proposes to assist in reducing the personal accident toll in the Federal service by shifting the financing of benefit payments in employment injury cases from a single appropriation to the appropriations of the employing agencies. The theory is, of course, that the agencies will develop a greater sense of responsibility in preventing accidents in the course of employment if they are required to discuss their accident rates in justifying appropriations to reimburse for claims of this nature.

It is estimated that this proposal will benefit approximately 2 million working men and women.

The House Education and Labor Committee has taken no action upon this measure since its introduction 11 months ago.

IX. A BILL TO EXTEND THE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM TO PUERTO RICO

This bill was introduced in the Senate—S. 2183—on June 10, 1955 and in the House—H. R. 6577—on May 31 1955.

Its purpose is to round out the effort which this Congress has heretofore made in meeting serious social problems in Puerto Rico: the evidence of this effort is that the fact that the Commonwealth now share in the benefits of the Federal-State unemployment service, the maternal and child-welfare program, the program for old-age assistance, aid to

dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently disabled, and the old-age and survivors' insurance program, and all of the other provisions of the Social Security Act except the unemployment compensation program.

Although the Commonwealth Government is making great strides in attracting new industry to overcome its labor surplus, the extension of the unemployment compensation program will help to maintain purchasing power and assist in stabilizing and bolstering Puerto Rico's economy until the effort to attract industry takes up the slack of unemployment.

It is estimated that this proposal will benefit approximately 185,000 working men and women.

The House Ways and Means Committee has taken no action upon this bill to this date.

The score upon these 9 first session administration proposals in the labor field thus is that 7 of them were introduced into the House almost a year ago.

One of these seven proposals was passed expeditiously into law.

Hearings were finally afforded three of these bills this month.

The appropriate House committees have taken no action on the remaining 3 proposals which were introduced almost a year ago, or on the 2 measures which were introduced in May and June of last year.

The effect of ignoring these first session proposals indicates a distressing lack of interest in the problems of wage earners on the part of the Democratic leadership of this House. Republican Members have added to this total of similar desirable legislation in this session by introducing additional bills which the administration supports; these proposals will also benefit great numbers of working men and women. These measures include providing for a nonoccupational disability insurance program for the District of Columbia—affecting approximately 225,000 workers—the regulation of welfare and pension plans—affecting approximately 12 million workers—an equal pay bill for women—affecting approximately 7 million workers—the transfer of the District of Columbia Unemployment Service to the District Commissioners, the regulation of the interstate transportation of migratory workers—affecting approximately 1 million workers—and the clarifying of the judicial enforcement of reservists' reemployment rights provision of the Universal Military and Training Act—affecting approximately 1½ million workers.

Now, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I do not say to you that these first session and second session proposals, like the philosopher's stone of old, will cure every ill in the areas to which they are directed. Hearings well may reveal that amendments and changes to their ideas will give a more valuable benefit in the particular situation as to which they are intended to correct an existing deficiency or supply an existing need. Adjustments of this nature are all part and parcel of this system of Government of ours.

But I do say to you that neither you nor I will have the privilege of examining these or similar worthy proposals until hearings are held on them or their subject matter. Such needed hearings have not been held.

The Democratic Party holds control of this House and its committees. It is therefore its responsibility either to open hearings or to continue to deny hearings with respect to these and many other equally worthy proposals. This responsibility can neither be dodged nor befogged by last-minute campaign demagogery. Fustian is no substitute for facts.

The Democratic Party must explain to the working men and women of this country in the forthcoming campaign that, through its responsibility, hearings have not been held. After this Congress returns on April 9, Democrat leadership will have one last chance to fish or cut bait.

I hope we will see this reluctant Democrat leadership encourage hearings upon these proposals between April 9 and the session's end.

It is time to substitute performance for promises. American wage earners will judge this Democratic Congress as the foot-dragging, do-nothing Congress unless it mends its ways.

And soon.

THE INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have already taken a good deal of the time of the House today during the appearances on the floor of my colleagues from Arizona and Montana, therefore I will take only a few additional minutes. There are two points which I would like to nail down and nail down as firmly as possible before we close the discussion for today on the Indian Claims Commission bill and the amendments being suggested to it before the appropriations subcommittee of the House by the Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. It is necessary that I leave to attend a committee meeting, but I should like to say to the gentleman that I hope legislation will be presented to the proper legislative committees of the House to review this mater. I quite agree with the gentleman and those who have spoken today that the proper way to legislate is not through appropriation riders. However, I do hope the gentleman will consider and that the Justice Department will send to the Congress for consideration this very important matter which may cost the taxpayers of this country somewhere in the neighborhood of $5 billion unless we have a review of the subject.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman very much for sharing our concern about the attempt to legislate on this through the Appropriations Committee, and I appreciate his point of view on it. I hope that the gentleman will join us who feel so concerned in doing what he can to prevent any action in the Committee on Appropriations on that suggested rider.

Mr. Speaker, there was some discussion a few moments ago as to whether or not the administration, back at the time of the passage of this bill, was in favor of its enactment. In this connection, the gentleman who just left the floor directed attention to the fact that there were opinions supplied by the Comptroller General and also by the Attorney General of the United States in which they recommended against passage of the Indian Claims Commission Act. I have reviewed those opinions supplied by the two officials on the executive side of the Government at that time, and it is true that they did make recommendations against passage of the legislation as it was written. They did propose some substantial changes with regard to the legislation. Some of the things which they proposed actually were incorporated into the bill in later stages of its consideration. The significant thing with regard to the position taken by the parties, however, is this: The bill was proposed by Democratic authors in a Democratic House of Representatives. It was enacted by a Democratic Congress, and it was signed into law by a Democratic President of the United States. If that does not make pretty clear the record of Democratic sponsorship and support for this legislation, I do not know how else you can establish it.

I think also it is rather significant that there was support from the other side of the aisle at that time. It is significant because of the language of the Republican Party platform which was cited with regard to this legislation by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] in his remarks appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 4, page 5319. Mr. CASE read this language from the Republican national platform in 1944:

> We pledge an immediate, just, and final settlement of all Indian claims between the Government and the Indian citizenship of the Nation.

Now, the Republican Party platform of 1944 did not say of all claims except those based on Indian title. They did not say of all claims except those based upon original title or aboriginal title or the right of occupancy. They said:

> We pledge an immediate, just, and equitable settlement of all Indian claims between the Government and the Indian citizenship of the Nation.

That was the position they took then. That was the right position. That was the same position as that taken by the Democratic Party at that time, and because that was the party position which both sides shared, there was bipartisan support for this legislation to adjudicate all of these claims.

The question is not so much, however, where the parties stood in 1944 or 1946. The question is this: Where do the parties stand today, in 1956, with regard to these Indian claims? Is the Republican Party of 1956 repudiating the language of its platform back in 1944 when they

come before us and say "You should not have a settlement of claims based upon Indian title or original title under this legislation." When the Assistant Attorney General comes before the House and says "We should change the law because it is going to cost us too much money," is he standing for immediate and final settlement of all claims, or is he qualifying those claims?

Incidentally, I am curious to know why the only reason which he can give against this legislation is it is going to cost too much money. He has not claimed that it is not fair to settle with the Indians. He has not claimed that it is not just to settle with them on these claims. He has not claimed at all that the Otoes should only have received 5 cents an acre for their land instead of the 75 cents an acre which was allowed to them under one portion of the Otoe decision. What he said is this: It is going to cost us too much money, so because it is going to cost us too much money, we have to change the law. That is the question for today. Where does the Republican Party and the Republican administration stand today with regard to the Indian rights of the Nation? Are they going to uphold the minority rights of one segment of our population on the one hand and then turn around and in the next breath, by a back-door entrance to a congressional committee seek to reduce and undermine the established and adjudicated rights of another minority group in our Nation? They are making a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde record on the subject of minority rights in this country if what they are doing with regard to Indian rights under the Indian Claims Commission is any indication of what their overall position is.

Let me nail for once and for all this question of what the intent of Congress was on the subject of Indian title. Here is the exact language presented to the House by the House managers in the conference committee report. I am going to quote it verbatim:

> The bill, as passed by the House of Representatives, enumerated six classes of claims cognizable by the Commission. The Senate, in the interest of simplicity, reduced these to three, being careful to state in its report, that the change was not intended to deprive the claimants of the right to invoke the jurisdiction of the Commission in any case which would have been cognizable under the language of the bill as it passed the House. Out of an abundance of caution the conferees reinserted two of the classifications struck by the Senate because they wanted to make sure that if any tribal claimant could prove facts sufficient to make a case under either of these classifications, the Commission would have authority to make an award to such claimant. * * * The second of these classifications covers claims arising from the taking by the United States of Indian lands, i. e., lands to which tribal claimants had Indian title or the right of occupancy. Sometimes these lands were taken under the guise of unratified treaties, sometimes without any semblance of a treaty. The reinsertion of this classification makes it plain that where claimant can prove sufficient facts within the language of this classification the Commission has full authority to award proper damages therefor.

There is the language of the managers in the conference, as presented on the floor of the House, with respect to Indian title or the right of occupancy. Clearly, the bill was intended to cover claims based on that kind of right.

Mr. Speaker, let me close with a quotation from a message of the President of the United States when he signed this bill into law. At that time, in 1946, he said:

> This bill makes perfectly clear what many men and women, here and abroad, have failed to recognize, that in our transactions with the Indian tribes we have at least since the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 set for ourselves the standard of fair and honorable dealings, pledging respect for all Indian property rights.

That was the spirit in which the President signed this bill into law. That is the spirit under which the Indians have prepared their cases over a period of 10 years for adjudication by the Indian Claims Commission. Are we today under the so-called great crusade of this administration to retreat from a standard of fair and honorable dealings with the Indian people of this Nation? That is the question which we believe the Attorney General of the United States should settle and settle conclusively with regard to the position his Department has been taking on the matter of Indian claims.

COMPANY ORGANIZATION

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include a speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, whenever I find anything out of the ordinary and especially wonderful I always try to take it down home to our beloved Alabama. I have been talking to Gen. Robert E. Wood for many, many long years and he has been telling me about the great organization that he had helped to perfect down through the years.

Of course, I did not think it was possible to find anybody in this particular kind of business half as wonderful as General Wood, but we had a great meeting down in that southern city of Atlanta, Ga., last week. The industralists from every State in the Union were there to listen to the head of this great corporation—the head of Sears, Roebuck & Co.—they say of Chicago, but I think it is of every State in the Union, and I believe we were told at this meeting that they had different businesses in some 35 countries.

Anyway, the principal speaker at this great meeting held at the Biltmore Hotel in Atlanta, Ga., was Mr. Ted V. Houser, chairman of the board of Sears, Roebuck & Co. The speech was truly amazing and fantastic, and it was so good that I wanted the Members of the Congress of the United States to know all about it. We have here in the Congress 435 men, who represent every human being in this great Nation of 165 million people. I want these men who represent this great Nation to read what this great man, T. V. Houser, had to say about the work they had done, are doing, and will continue to do. It is almost unbelievable, and there is no way to tell about it except as Mr. Houser unfolded the story; it was almost like a fairy tale.

It shows you what brains and ability can do; what organization can do; and that is what this great company has done. It developed in the meeting by the man who introduced Mr. Houser that Mr. Houser used to be with Montgomery Ward, and I was just wondering if he—Ted Houser—is not a mixture of two great men, who have led two great businesses to such high places in this Nation. I am speaking of Gen. Robert E. Wood, of Sears, Roebuck & Co., and the great one and only—just like General Wood, only of a different calibre—Sewell Avery. General Wood, with his associates, has led Sears, Roebuck & Co.; Mr. Sewell Avery and his associates have led Montgomery Ward. I do not know but what every man and woman and every boy and girl in this Nation know about these people. I remember when I was a little boy, I used to look at their catalogs with their beautiful things and just wish for them. Then they only had, I guess, 1 or 2 stores, but now they have them everywhere.

I think this great story, as related by my friend, T. V. Houser, will be an inspiration to all men everywhere and will show just what can be done by working, pulling together and praying, as I am sure this great man does.

I spent a long time with Mr. T. V. Houser. I had Gen. Lewis A. Pick, former Chief of the Army Engineers, with me, along with Mr. Pleas Looney, General Pick's assistant, from Alabama. Mr. Houser had with him some wonderful men. I will name a few of them—Frank Parsons of their great Atlanta office; Edward Gudeman, of their Chicago office; John J. Amato, also of Chicago; C. H. Kellstadt, of Atlanta; and many other great men who represent these men and women that own this great plant from all over this Nation, and almost all over the world, and I think they will be all over the world sooner or later, if they keep going.

This man Houser is a very sincere and serious man, and like the man he succeeded, General Wood, he has a brilliant brain, a world of energy and an imagination that is truly wonderful. For instance, General Pick asked him how much money they had out on the installment plan, that they let our people in every State in the Union have, so they could have all of these great necessities of life. I believe he said, Mr. Speaker, $900 million. Think of it—$900 million—just distributed to the men and women and the boys and girls of this Nation. This makes it possible, on the installment plan, to own so many wonderful things—practically everything.

I was amazed to find out the different things they do, and I will not try to tell about it, because I want, at this time, to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which will go to every library and every beat in this Nation, a speech by Mr. T. V. Houser, so everybody can know about what a group of men are doing—their plans and how they do it. I believe it will help them along with their busi-

ness, or the business they hope to get, because all of the little businesses want to be big businesses, and that is what they are working for.

The only way to properly appreciate what I am telling you is to read this great message that was given to us by a great man in a great city—Atlanta, Ga. I wish we could not only read this message, but could hear the story that was told us after the meeting was over in the rooms of Mr. Houser, where he had this group around, and where he talked to General Pick, Pleas Looney, and me for so long.

They are wonderful people; they are doing great work; they are the most unselfish group I have ever known, and I wanted everybody everywhere to know about it. I believe the speech that I am inserting here will give us the message.

I wish the other men that head the great corporations of this Nation would do the same thing. I believe it would do a lot of good, because while I have been close to them and I have visited with General Wood in Alaska, I have had him to visit me in Mobile—as a matter of fact, he will be coming down to Alabama just this very week—and we have kept in close touch with each other here in Washington, in Chicago and everywhere, I just had no idea of the magnitude of this great business that this speech so well describes.

The address follows:

The agenda for your day's discussions includes the subject of company organization, and I thought a leaf or two from Sears experience might be of interest to you.

Sears has traditionally been a growth company, and its growth is reflected in the evolution of its organizational structure. In tracing the development of organization through almost 70 years, several distinct periods can be seen, each one an era of growth, and each one associated with a modification of the organization to adjust to the problems of growth. As a growing and profitable company in the early days of mail order, Sears, Roebuck & Co. had attracted a group of highly competent aggressive men. It suited the purposes and personal inclinations of both Richard Sears, the founder of the business, and Julius Rosenwald, who succeeded Mr. Sears as the chief officer of the company, to give these men a relatively free rein. Thus from the beginning, Sears organization has never been the result of a master-mind plan, but rather of periodic appraisal of new conditions, with a resulting continuous series of adjustments. The history of Sears, from an organizational point of view, is largely a record of the response of a relatively fluid, loose-structured, highly personal type of organization to changing business conditions and growth, the absorption of new groups of people in various administrative and staff capacities, and the development of interauthorities and responsibilities.

Sears was founded in 1886 as a mail-order merchandising business and continued as such for almost 40 years. During these early years, the business was carried on from a single mail-order plant. Businesses conducted in a single location, as Sears was in those days, usually adopt a functional type of organization built around the three primary functions of any business—sales, procurement, or production, and auditing-finance—with the head of the business appointing individuals in charge of these activities. He looks to them for specialized knowledge and direct responsibility for results in these areas. In such an organization, all threads come together at only one point, namely, the head of the business, and he alone can be responsible for the overall success or failure of the enterprise. He cannot separate off any one part of the business and look to some individual to be responsible for the complete functioning of that part, and therefore responsible for that much of the profit and loss of the whole.

The Sears organization fell into this basic pattern, but with an important variation brought about by the special characteristics of a mail-order business. The function called merchandise embraced both the procurement of goods and sales responsibility as well, inasmuch as it planned and produced the medium of sale—the catalog. Because of its fundamental importance in this dual role, it came to be dominant in the organization. The activity comparable to production functions in other types of businesses was called operating, and was concerned with the physical handling of customer orders, the receipt and shipment of merchandise and the large volume of customer correspondence associated with the mail-order business. The auditing-finance activity was conventional.

Mr. Julius Rosenwald called this organization a federation of merchants, and this in itself is indicative of the importance attached to the merchandise side of the business from the early days of the company. The merchandise function was carried on by a group of department heads, each one in charge of a given line of merchandise. These department heads had almost unquestioned authority within their lines. They established quality standards and selling prices of their merchandise, selected sources of supply and dealth with them, using the two buying advantages Sears possessed in those days—volume purchasing and prompt payment of bills. In some cases, where merchandise procurement problems made it necessary for the company to buy or build factory operations, such factories were under the supervision of the appropriate merchandise department head. Accuracy of copy and illustrations of merchandise offered in the catalog were the responsibility of department heads.

The merchandise department heads reported to the vice president in charge of merchandising in the general merchandise office. As near as I can determine, the merchandising office concerned itself largely with overall inventory control and establishing size and cost limits of the catalog. In keeping with the federation concept, the general merchandise office influenced the merchandise departments only to the extent required to fulfill these two principal responsibilities.

A counterpart of the general merchandise office existed in the operating function in the office of the operating vice president. The operating activity was concerned with the receipt of customer orders, preparation of tickets for each merchandise department, general correspondence, and the receipt of incoming merchandise. To carry out this function, a series of systems were established and precise production routines were developed. Schedules were devised for handling the flow of work, and successful operation of the plant depended on extremely rigid adherence to these schedules and routines.

Here we have a situation which contained some seeds of conflict. The merchandise department heads had extreme latitude and were aggressive enough to claim every function related to their departments, some of which overlapped to a considerable degree those of the operating vice president. On the other hand, the operating people were accountable for the handling of orders and felt that their control of every operating function would insure the smooth and precise performance of the mail order plant. Conflicts did arise, but they were settled on a basis of negotiations between the functions concerned on a day-to-day basis. No decrees were issued outlining the boundaries between jobs. Instead there was a process of adjustment over a period of years, the net result being a clearer definition of jobs, with the merchandise function and its department heads gradually becoming limited to those matters clearly related to merchandising.

Another conflict arose later when a group of men began to question the techniques used to present merchandise in the catalogs. These men were convinced that advertising was becoming a specialized field, requiring specialized techniques. At this time Sears did not have a separate advertising department. The layout, art work, typography, and copy for catalog pages was either prepared by the individual merchandise departments or by the company-owned printing plant under their close supervision. The printing plant merely followed instructions in the physical production of the catalog. The only limitations on the advertising activities of the merchandise departments were those imposed by the general merchandise office as to the size and cost of the catalog.

With the sale of the printing plant and the contracting of catalog production with others, a mail order advertising department gradually developed with highly skilled specialists in the field of layout, art work, copy, and general advertising techniques. In general, the final evolution of this particular activity was to leave authority for selection of goods and allocation of catalog space by items to the merchandise people, with the advertising people pretty largely taking over the rest. There are still some marginal questions such as use of color pages and selections therefore, which are usually resolved by requiring the joint approval of both advertising and merchandise departments.

Basically these two modifications of the merchandise department heads authority can be traced to technical changes. The production line techniques developed by the operating people required a greater degree of integration of the operating functions for efficiency. In a like manner, the specialized techniques that were developing in advertising could be employed more efficiently by the creation of an advertising department staffed with people skilled in the various specialties.

Technical changes, however, were not the sole or the most important influence on the Sears organization. From 1886 until 1907, all of Sears business was carried on from a single mail order plant. In 1907 a branch office was opened in Dallas, Tex., and thus the company assumed territorial dimensions, which, in my opinion bring with them the really major complications in any business organization.

Between 1907 and 1920, Sears opened mail order plants in Dallas, Seattle, and Philadelphia. As Sears operations became dispersed geographically, it was perhaps natural that the people responsible for the various functions in Chicago should try to operate these plants by simply extending their authority to the distant operation. However, by the time the fourth mail-order plant was opened in Philadelphia in 1920, it was plain to see that there was a need for an appraisal of this type of company organization. For one thing, delays in handling problems and the lack of knowledge of local and regional conditions were proving to be real limitations. It also became obvious that the personnel in the outlying mail-order plants could not possibly report in detail on all of their work to Chicago, nor could the people in Chicago make all of the detailed decisions necessary in these remote locations.

Out of this appraisal came the recognition that a delegation of responsibility and a certain measure of authority had to be made to local plant management. Watchfulness, guidance, and an intimate knowledge of the individuals and problems in the field was substituted for direct control by Chicago. In effect, the functional people in Chicago

began to assume a staff relationship to top management and became less and less a part of a line chain of command. Each local plant was responsible for maintenance of inventories and availability of goods for customer orders in such distant plant. It was not responsible for selection of goods in the catalog or the source of supply and buying terms for such merchandise.

Along in the middle twenties, this evolution was recognized to the extent that the merchandising responsibility of the Chicago plant, which had been directed by the merchandise function, was removed from that authority and put on the same basis as the other mail-order plants. Thus the separation of powers between a parent group and local management of a mail order plant was beginning to take shape. The experience gained in this period of mail-order expansion was put to good use when Sears started opening retail stores in 1925. Not only were the retail stores also physically remote from headquarters operation, but they also represented a new type of business to Sears, thus introducing an element of diversification which had not been present before.

The retail stores were fitted into the existing pattern of organization, with the store managers reporting to the mail-order plant managers. This pattern seemed logical for several reasons, but primarily because of the jobbing function performed for retail stores by the mail-order plants. In addition, most of the retail stores initially opened were located in the mail-order plants themselves or in the metropolitan areas of mail-order plant cities, thus making the physical job of supervision by mail-order plant management relatively easy.

The company's expansion in the retail field was carried on at a rapid rate, and at the end of 1929, almost 5 years after the first store was opened, there were 324 retail stores. By this time it had become apparent that the physical scope of retail operations and the variety of local problems—inventory, local competition, community and customer relations—were such that a reappraisal of the organization was necessary.

The field organization which grew out of this reappraisal became the forerunner of our present organization. Regional managers were established on a territorial basis for the supervision of the retail stores, which were then separated from mail-order supervision. Retail stores reported to a district manager in each territory.

This organization was probably rather typical of chain-store operations at that time, but this form of organization lasted only a relatively short time because very fundamental weaknesses became apparent. The center of authority tended toward the district manager, which did not give enough latitude to the local store manager to handle those purely local matters properly—local personnel, sales promotion, inventory control, and so forth. Also the district managers were so removed from Chicago management that they could not properly interpret basic company policies and could not keep up with new developments emanating from the central organization.

The next step was to have all of the larger stores, called "A" stores, either individual or large city groups, report theoretically to the president of the company, and the smaller stores regrouped into fewer and larger group now called zones. The zone manager now had too many stores to attempt close and detailed direction but was in a better position to interpret overall company plans and policies, keep up with new merchandise developments, check personnel selection and training, and in short perform a rather broad administrative supervision. These zone managers theoretically reported also to the president of the company. In practice, a retail administrator, occupying a staff position to the president, reviewed store results and advised the president on many details. A personnel and employee-relations department was beginning to emerge at this time, which was also under the direction of the retail administrator so that there could be coordination between operating results and personnel administration.

The company made great strides during this period of the late thirties and during the war years under this general form of organization. The concept developed that the merchandise and operating functions in Chicago were there to develop plans and procedures covering merchandising selection and availability, sales techniques, store arrangement and operating methods to obtain the most efficient costs. In a general way, stores were expected to accept and put into use such plans and be responsible to the president for specific profit and loss performance. Some of the details covered in this over-all parent activity were mandatory for the stores, but the range of details that were optional was also very broad.

Up to 1941, the complete functions of merchandise, operating, auditing-finance, personnel and public relations were all in Chicago. In theory at least, none of these functions were specifically responsible for the execution of their functional activity in any single store because of the fact that these parent functions were by-passed by the line of authority from president to store group or zone manager. In practice, many store managers were not experienced enough for this long distance Chicago administrative supervision, and the three primary functions of merchandise, operating and auditing performed many rather direct functional jobs of supervision, but largely on a trouble-shooting basis.

In 1941, General Wood recognized that some intermediate position was necessary between the centralizing of all functional activities in Chicago and the extreme decentralization of day-to-day operations to 617 stores over the country. Beginning then and completed after the war, five territories were established, each under an officer of the company. Store, group and zone managers in each territory now were responsible to this territorial officer for operating results. In effect, the president of the company had now moved to five places, insofar as daily operations of the business were concerned. The operating function of Chicago was abolished insofar as any administrative activity was concerned, and thus became part of the territorial officer's responsibility.

Now with this historical background, let us take a good look at the organization we have today, because it is essentially a refinement of this last territorial principle.

The basic elements of the organization structure are first a staff of specialists and technicians which we call the parent, and which is without administrative authority in a coercive sense. Secondly, territorial administrative units to whom store results are accountable, and who in turn bypass the entire parent organization by being responsible direct to the president of the company.

This parent organization consists of 4,681 people. In its relations to the mail order, retail, and factory operating units, it is at one and the same time a banker, the landlord, the supplier of professional and technical skills; and in the president and chairman the final authority of company management. As banker, the parent organization loans working capital at the rate of 4 percent to every operating unit to cover inventories—credit accounts receivable—and necessary cash balances. At peak periods the total sum required for these purposes may exceed $1½ billion. As landlord, it provides store buildings and parking-lot facilities for which a rental charge is made of 4 percent on the undepreciated balance of the cost. For both owned and leased buildings, this landlord function provides investment in store fixtures and equipment, trucks, and all necessary capital goods, for which interest charge is also made on the unamortized balance.

In its capacity of being a professional staff the following functions are represented: Parent operating, which consists of divisions specializing in customer mechanical service, retail procedures, mail-order procedures, the service of supply to both mail-order plants and stores, a general traffic department which includes in its activity the company-owned over-the-road truck lines as well as rail-freight-forwarding operations, a communications department, operating one of the country's largest internal communications systems, and an operations research department, which in addition to its purely research function also supervises the departments which actually operate the computers and various other electronic equipment used in our parent organization.

The auditing, or controller's function, is made up of retail, mail order, parent, foreign, and merchandise accounting divisions, and a general auditing statistics unit, the insurance department and the credit department.

The personnel activity consists of sections responsible for employee relations, employee benefits and personnel policies, compensation, employee training and executive development, which includes a unit preparing and administrating correspondence courses for employee training, psychological testing and employee morale surveys. This latter activity carries on considerable research in this highly specialized field.

The factory management department serves the wholly owned factories and subsidiary factories in the same way in which other parent departments serve the mail-order plants and retail stores. Within the factory organization are units responsible for soft-line factories, hard line, electronic, plastic and paint factories. In addition, there is an industrial engineering unit, a personnel department, and a factory controllers department.

The public relations department is comprised of sections responsible for contributions and memberships, press relations, consumer education, employee publications and research. Located in this department also are the individuals in charge of the major projects of the Sears-Roebuck Foundation—agricultural programs, urban renewal, aid to education, which includes our scholarship program, and medical assistance. In addition, there is a controller for this activity.

The treasurer's office is responsible for the cashiering activity in all company units, the maintenance of banking relations and stockholder records. In addition, the tax department, with sections devoted to Federal taxes, foreign taxes, State taxes, local taxes, licenses, and manufacturers taxes, reports to the treasurer's office. Incidentally, it takes 135 people to handle Sears tax matters in Chicago and in the field.

The legal department is staffed with men specializing in various aspects of our business such as real estate, merchandise, factories, operating, and personnel. In addition it serves the traditional function of maintaining the nonfinancial corporate records.

The property department is made up of units in charge of various phases of construction and maintenance work, including architectural, structural, electrical, mechanical, temperature control and plumbing engineering, estimating, building material purchasing, and field construction supervision. An extensive drafting section supports the work of this department.

Our Latin-American operations are represented in Chicago by a parent function headed up by a vice president who in effect is a sixth territorial officer. On his staff are men who work with 36 stores in Sears 6 Latin-American corporations on personnel,

merchandise, ordering, shipping, construction and real-estate problems.

The parent merchandise function is comprised of 50 buying departments, catalog preparation, production, and distribution departments, a merchandise development and testing laboratory, a store planning and display division, a packaging and a merchandise-control operation, a merchandise comparison unit, a quality-control operation, an economic research department, and a department which purchases the supplies and mechanical equipment employed in the business.

All of these staff departments are maintained by a charge of a certain percent of sales made to every operating unit. This charge is designed to offset the exact cost of maintaining this staff of experts. This leaves the interest and rent received from operating units as income to this parent function, against which must be charged the interest paid banks for loans or costs of installment financing. The parent on the books of the company is the owner of factories and investments in subsidiaries, both manufacturing, foreign and retail companies, and Allstate insurance companies, and dividends from such investments are a part of this parent income account. There is for every operating unit a profit and loss statement monthly as well as a balance sheet, which constitutes the accounting between such operating unit and Chicago parent. Thus for 707 retail stores and 11 mail order houses, there are some 8,616 complete profit and loss and balance sheet statements prepared annually. In addition, there are test or sample statements covering factories, catalog sales offices, telephone sales units, and miscellaneous enterprises such as the diamond shop, the gun repair shop—even our company airplanes. Twice a year profit and loss statements are prepared for each of some 50 merchandise departments of each mail order plant and of 106 retail stores. Thus we have a total of about 20,500 profit and loss statements annually.

Now a word as to the functioning of this parent organization and its relations with operating units. We will use the buyer's job in the merchandise function as an illustration. Each buyer is responsible for the selection, design, or development of his specialized line of merchandise; he is responsible for the determination of the manufacturing source of supply and for the terms and conditions of purchase. He notifies each operating unit where applicable about his merchandise, and while no one else in the company has the authority to purchase or deal with manufacturers for his kind of goods, at the same time he does not have the authority to order any single store to carry his line of goods. Thus we achieve all the advantages of a highly centralized buying authority with the extreme decentralized authority to each store manager to express his own judgment as to the merchandise in his store. The buyer recommends a selling price and calculates the gross profit that should result to a store with a proper balance of sales between various lines and items. The buyer must make his commitments with a manufacturer without knowing to what degree the individual stores will back up his judgment. He may have the hedge of cataloging the item for mail order selling, which is his responsibility. Otherwise, he depends upon previous experience, his judgment as to acceptability of the merchandise in question, and the persuasion of himself and the sales manager of his department.

The buyer may not know just which stores carry certain of his items, but as orders flow to the manufacturer, it is his responsibility to see that sufficient lead time is provided for manufacture so that a supply will be available for ensuing demand. The local operating unit is wholly responsible for keeping goods in stock to serve the demand of its customers and for controlling the overall inventory so as to avoid both financial strain and seasonal carryover. Thus you see again the assumption locally of those operations which can be performed locally without detailed administration from the outside, except the overall territorial administrative office. The merchandise office in the parent is responsible for sales plans of the company as a whole, and this means minute correlatiton of the logistics concerning raw material supply to the factory, manufacturing process, distribution time to stores, advertising mat service, window and interior display information to stores, and enough advance time for employee understanding and instruction.

I will not attempt to describe in detail the many other staff activities of the parent whose wide range of interest was given in the former list, but I want to mention quite briefly the relationship of the controller's office and the personnel department with the territorial and field organization.

Since the controller's office has the responsibility of safeguarding company property, it has a direct line of communication through representatives in the territorial offices and thus direct to the store. This direct line is a necessary safety measure in a company doing business in 2,000 locations with a merchandise inventory of $500 million and installment accounts on the books totaling $900 million where uniform accounting practices are essential.

The personnel department evolves techniques and procedures which must be sold to the field on their merits. From this standpoint the influence of this department depends on the quality of its work. But it has an additional responsibility of developing a list of promotable people or the reserve group as we call it. In the maintenance and development of this reserve group, essential in a company which has a firm policy of promotion from within, the personnel department plays an important part in the development and advancement of individuals. This is especially true of interterritorial promotions, where an overall judgment as well as a point of coordination is necessary.

With the development of these staff functions, the question arises, How can one be sure that the best use is made of the specialized knowledge available in the functional or staff jobs? After all, staff people have no authority to apply their knowledge direct to a line operation or to force line personnel to accept their findings. At Sears we have solved the situation by what I call the right of challenge. Regardless of the results being obtained by the individual management of a distant unit, the function which now has a purely staff character in the overall picture, has the right to challenge the results or the way they were obtained, so far as its specialty is concerned. The fact that acts of local management are subject to challenge by someone who knows far more about a certain subject than anyone in the local organization, is the price local management pays for its latitude in a decentralized operation. In effect, local management must be prepared to show that it is openminded, willing to take advantage of the highly developed skills found in the staff functions, and is applying with good judgment the specialized knowledge available to it in the staff departments.

In conclusion, while I have attempted a chronological history of the development of the present structural form of Sears corporate organization and its functioning in a broad sense, one must recognize that other factors have been envolving concurrently, which have been essential to the successful functioning of this organization. Probably personnel policies have been the most important of these factors. As I see it, sound merchandise policies, or public relations or finance, all of these could be reasonably successful, regardless of the particular structural form of the organization, but since the very essence of organization involves the way people work together, the whole atmosphere of personnel plays an important part. Sears has been fortunate in having a rich heritage from its earliest days of attaching great importance to the individual. Its well known profit-sharing plan started in 1916 was an early and tangible recognition of the responsibility and respect for the individual on the part of the company's management. It has been a magnet through the years of pulling in the one direction of overall company success the individual actions of thousands of people. There may be disputes at times between the individuals or company units as to the best way of performing some operation, but the fact that each party has in mind only the best interests of the company as a whole is taken for granted.

Practically the only place open for newcomers at Sears is at the bottom, if one may include in that phrase the basic-training program which certain selected but thoroughly inexperienced men undertake. I do not have time to cover the many highly organized techniques employed to identify promising talent at various levels of advancement and how we guide and direct their development. Every attempt is made to create an atmosphere wherein character and ability are recognized and a constant flow of talent through all levels is maintained. The new and expanded facilities in just the last 5 years alone created jobs for 24,000 people with all that this implies in the way of supervisory and technical positions.

We subject line executives, as I have indicated, to the discipline of the profit and loss and balance sheet statement. Their earnings are in proportion to results. While we believe in very adequate, competent, and highly specialized staff assistants, we are quite successful in preventing a bureaucratic atmosphere by giving no authority to such specialists so far as the line organization is concerned. They must attain influence through acceptance of sheer merit.

Many students of organization would say that an organization where 65 departments report to a functional officer, or 36 report to a line officer could not work. It does seem to work, however. The intangibles which make it work are far more difficult to recognize, identify, and evalute than mere physical form. I am sure that a business organization can get too large for a rigid, tightly compartmentized, dictatorial kind of organization, and must turn to greater and greater reliance on the initiative and good judgment of the individual, making sure that such individuals are the product of advancement through merit with adequate exeprience and motivated toward a common goal.

SOCIAL-SECURITY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the part I have had in enacting legislation to permit State road workers, State employees, municipal workers, and schoolteachers to come under the provisions of the Social Security Act. One of my first acts after coming to Congress was to advocate the embracing of this group of workers under the coverage of this humanitarian act. I feel I have had quite a large part in strengthening and liberalizing this law.

We have done much in the past 20 years since the existence of the social security program to improve its benefits, but there is still room for further improvements. That is why I am shocked

and saddened that we have an administration which opposes the lowering of the age at which women can receive social security benefits.

Where can a woman past 60 obtain employment these days? Who will employ women of this age? There is no place for women past 60 in the commercial job market. As a matter of fact where can men find gainful employment when they are past 60. I am in favor of lowering the age of both men and women with an increase in the provisions.

During the 84th Congress we have amended the social-security law to continue benefits to permanently and totally disabled children after they have reached the age of 18; extended coverage to certain professional groups and others not heretofore covered; lowered the retirement age of women from 65 to 62, bringing immediate benefits to 800,000 additional women; provided disability insurance benefits to some 250,000 permanently and totally disabled workers aged 50 or over.

I am astonished that the administration opposes the House-approved provision which provides for the payment of benefits to the permanently disabled at the age of 50. Certainly the provision paying benefits to a disabled man at age 50 is no more than right. How can a man who is totally and permanently disabled provide a living for his family? Only the most callous could oppose this provision.

Actually, I believe the retirement age should be lowered even below that set in the House-approved bill. I feel that men should be allowed to retire under social security after reaching the age of 60 and that women should be allowed to retire at an even lower age.

It is unfortunate that the present administration refuses to improve the social-security law. If we go ahead and pass this bill, it will be the cornerstone for security and happiness for the disabled and aged in our society.

This is not a giveaway program. This is not charity. Every man and woman who participates pays into this fund and it does not cost the Government 1 cent. I do not see how anyone can conscientiously oppose the program. I hope and pray that the Senate in its wisdom will see fit to improve the House version as passed last year instead of undermining and weakening the bill.

The Social Security Act has closed the poor houses all over the Nation and has made respectable citizens of our aged so they can face their sunset years with faith and confidence. I look at these things in the light of the teachings of the Master of Galilee and try to be helpful to the aged and infirmed.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CANFIELD, for 20 minutes, on today.

Mr. PRICE, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. SCOTT, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. STAGGERS, for 15 minutes, on today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. TRIMBLE) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRANAHAN (at the request of Mr. O'HARA of Illinois).

Mr. DIGGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WICKERSHAM (at the request of Mr. KLEIN) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILL and to include a statement by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson before the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. AVERY.

Mr. BOW and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HESELTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. REED of New York.

Mr. METCALF.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER in two instances.

Mr. WOLVERTON.

Mr. BYRD (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VANIK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 374. An act to authorize the adjustment and clarification of ownership to certain lands within the Stanislaus National Forest, Tuolumne County, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 1005. An act for the relief of Alice Duckett;

H. R. 1082. An act for the relief of Golda I. Stegner;

H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Porter;

H. R. 1855. An act to amend the act approved April 24, 1950, entitled "an act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes";

H. R. 1892. An act for the relief of Dr. Lu Ho Tung and his wife, Ching-hsi (nee Tsao) Tung;

H. R. 2946. An act for the relief of Eugene Dus;

H. R. 3233. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to make it a criminal offense to move or travel in interstate commerce with intent to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for arson;

H. R. 4039. An act for the relief of Julian, Dolores, Roldan, and Julian, Jr., Lizardo;

H. R. 5889. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the town of Savannah Beach, Tybee Island, Ga.;

H. R. 6421. An act for the relief of Roy Cowan and others;

H. R. 6461. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 6463. An act to ratify and confirm section 4539, Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945, section 1 (b), act 12, Session Laws of Hawaii 1951, and the sales of public lands consummated pursuant to the terms of said statutes;

H. R. 6574. An act to amend section 2 of title IV of the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 680), as amended;

H. R. 6807. An act to authorize the amendment of certain patents of Government lands containing restrictions as to use of such lands in the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 6808. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 6824. An act to authorize the amendment of the restrictive covenant on land patent No. 10,410, issued to Keoshi Matsunaga, his heirs or assigns, on July 20, 1936, and covering lot 48 of Ponahawai house lots, situated in the County of Hawaii, T. H.;

H. R. 7236. An act to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to water-conservation practices;

H. R. 8100. An act to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of Brazil;

H. R. 9166. An act to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates;

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to release reversionary right to improvements on a 3-acre tract in Orangeburg County, S. C.; and

H. J. Res. 464. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Fifth International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 29, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1684. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report stating that no reservations were made during the calendar year 1955, relating to lands within Indian reservations valuable for power or reservoir sites or necessary for use in connection with irrigation projects, pursuant to section 13 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 858); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1685. A letter from the Chairman, United States Commission for the Celebration in 1955 of the 200th Anniversary of the Birth of John Marshall, transmitting the final report of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the 200th Anniversary of the Birth of John Marshall, pursuant to Public Law 581, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 396. Joint

resolution to establish a national motto of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1959). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9952. A bill to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty; without amendment (Rept. No. 1960). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. Senate Joint Resolution 122. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1961). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. Senate Joint Resolution 123. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1962). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. Senate Joint Resolution 124. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1963). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 7679. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Muskogee, Okla.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1967). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 8123. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1968). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 8490. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Bonham, Tex.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1969). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 8674. A bill to provide for the return of certain property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1970). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 9260. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1971). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 9263. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to remove certain impediments to the processing of applications for Veterans' Administration direct loans, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1972). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 10046. A bill to simplify and make more nearly uniform the laws governing the payment of compensation for service-connected disability or death, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1973). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 9824. A bill to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean service period in combat or from an instrumentality of war; with amendment (Rept. No. 1974). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Thirteenth Intermediate Report of Certain Activities Regarding Power, Department of the Interior (Changes in power line regulations) (Rept. No. 1975). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 581. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1964). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 591. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1965). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1484. A bill for the relief of Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen; with amendment (Rept. No. 1966). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 10249. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H. R. 10250. A bill to amend section 2056 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 10251. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to deed certain land to the city of Grand Junction, Colo.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 10252. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10253. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 10254. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10255. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10256. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 10257. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 10258. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10259. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10260. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 10261. A bill to provide a further increase in the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 10262. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 10263. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, entitled "Copyrights" with respect to certain fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 10264. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to permit the barter or exchange of surplus agricultural commodities with certain foreign countries with which such barter or exchange was formerly prohibited; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 10265. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase in certain cases the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 10266. A bill designating the first day of May in each year as Friendship Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 10267. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to assist in the provision of housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 10268. A bill to provide assistance to the States in the construction, modernization, additions, and/or improvement of domiciliary or hospital buildings of State or Territorial-operated soldiers' homes by a grant to subsidize in part the capital outlay cost; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 10269. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place metallurgical grade alumina on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 10270. A bill to provide for the development by the Secretary of the Interior of Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 10271. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to furnish memorial markers or plaques commemorating certain deceased members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 10272. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an officer or employee of a State or local government to elect social security coverage as a self-employed individual if he is not covered by a retirement system and the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system has not been extended to his services by an agreement under section 218 of that act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 10273. A bill to provide for the development by the Secretary of the Interior of Independence National Historical Park,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 10274. A bill to provide for payments in lieu of taxes on account of the real property constituting Sunflower Village, Johnson County, Kans.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 10275. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of Federal funds payable thereunder to States which have approved plans for old-age assistance and which maintain their expenditures for such assistance at or above the 1955 level; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. R. 10276. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H. R. 10277. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey to be made of the Mohawk River at and in the vicinity of Schoharie and Greene Counties, N. Y., and of the Hudson River in the vicinity of Columbia, Dutchess, Greene, Schoharie, and Ulster Counties, N. Y., in the interests of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. J. Res. 595. Joint resolution to amend section 404 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, with respect to excess baggage charges collected by air carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. Res. 452. Resolution to authorize the Select Committee on Small Business to investigate and study the problems of small business with respect to basic and applied scientific research and development work; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the House of Representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation revising and extending the Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation revising and extending the Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 10278. A bill for the relief of Mr. Dusan Lezaja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 10279. A bill for the relief of Albert H. Ruppar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 10280. A bill for the relief of Fiorindo Francesco Nappo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 10281. A bill for the relief of Walter C. Jordan and Elton W. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 10282. A bill for the relief of Evangelia Harlaos Papamattheakis Lester; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. J. Res. 596. Joint resolution waiving certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

785. By Mr. BOW: Petition of Herman E. Seiser and others of Stark County, Ohio, for separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

786. Also, petition of W. C. Gonder and others of Stark, Tuscarawas and Wayne Counties, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

787. Also, petition of Byron S. Miller and others of Stark County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

788. Also, petition of Stephen Garfield and others of Stark and Tuscarawas Counties, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

789. Also, petition of Michael DeGirolamo and others of Alliance, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

790. Also, petition of Josephine E. Carmichael and others of Stark County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

791. Also, petition of E. J. Kuntz and others of Stark County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

792. Also, petition of E. C. Williner and others of Stark and Tuscarawas Counties, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

793. Also, petition of J. A. Eames and others of Stark County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

794. Also, petition of William Wilson and others of Stark County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

795. Also, petition of Howard G. Thorley and others of Canton, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

796. Also, petition of Hon. R. E. Fair, mayor of Shanesville, Ohio, and others of Tuscarawas County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

797. Also, petition of E. J. Hunsinger and others of Stark County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

798. By Mr. ELLSWORTH: Petition of Jerusha E. Brown and 31 other residents of the cities of Albany and Eugene, Oreg., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

799. Also, petition of 44 members of post 1775, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Glendale, Oreg., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

800. Also, petition of Henry La Barge and 44 other citizens of Brookings and Harbor, Oreg., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

800. Also, petition of Henry La Barge and 45 other residents of the cities of Jacksonville, Central Point, and Medford, Oreg., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

802. Also, petition of William Kidder and 44 other residents of the cities of Eugene, Fall Creek, Lowell, and Dexter, Oreg., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

803. By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of 22 residents of Glendale, Calif., urging enactment of legislation which prohibits alcoholic-beverage advertising on radio, television, and in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

804. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition urging enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

805. By Mr. JENKINS: Petition of 270 members of Post Hocking, No. 6430, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Logan, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

806. Also, petition of 45 members of Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post, No. 7174, The Plains, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

807. Also, petition of 145 members of Veterans of Foreign Wars Post, Nelsonville, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

808. Also, petition of 45 members of Veterans of Foreign Wars Post, Ironton, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

809. Also, petition of 45 members of Veterans of Foreign Wars Post, Ironton, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension porgram for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

810. Also, petition of 46 members of Veterans of Foreign Wars Post, Basil, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

811. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Veterans of Foreign Wars Post, Ottumwa, Iowa, urging enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

812. By Mr. RABAUT: Petition of Earl M. Scringer and other residents of Detroit, Mich., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

813. Also, petition of Conrad H. Bannasch and other residents of Detroit, Mich., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

814. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, International Union United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), Detroit, Mich., relative to Packard Local Union No. 190, UAW, going on record as endorsing the McNamara bill, S. 1206, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Easter Address by Senator Wiley and Editorial on Empire State Building Lights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was interested to read in last Friday's—March 23—issue of the Ripon (Wis.) Press, an editorial entitled "The Light Shineth in Darkness." It refers to the revolving beacons which will shine from atop the world's highest building—the Empire State Building—as a symbol of America's faith and freedom, and as a guide to the world.

As was stated by Col. Henry Crown, president of the Empire State Building Corp., these lights may symbolize "not only welcome—but the unlimited opportunities of America and our hopes and prayers for peace."

It is most appropriate, as we approach the hallowed Easter observance, that we turn our thoughts to man's greatest goal, his dearest wish—a just and enduring peace.

I sent to the desk the text of the Ripon Press editorial. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to be followed by the text of a pertinent radio address which I am delivering over most of the radio stations of my State on the theme of Easter.

There being no objection, the editorial and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Ripon (Wis.) Press of March 23, 1956]

THE LIGHT SHINETH IN DARKNESS

Announcement has just been made of the "air age supplement to the American welcome so long extended to shipborne visitors by the Statue of Liberty." This new aerial symbol of welcome and freedom, which it is hoped can be turned on for Easter Sunday, will be visible to overseas visitors for 300 miles out over the Atlantic.

Described as a spectacular electronic tiara, this bright new welcome will be provided by 4 revolving beacons 1,092 feet above the sidewalks of New York atop the world-famous Empire State Building. These 4 Empire State lights, generating a brilliance of nearly 4 billion candlepower will be the brightest continuous source of man-made light in the world. The 4 huge lamps, weighing a ton apiece, are being installed at the base of the mighty television tower that provides the antenna for all 7 of New York City's TV stations. The synchronized beacons will revolve counterclockwise at approximately 1 revolution per minute, and will be in operation from sundown until midnight.

Air travelers in our own country will see the Empire State lights from as far away as Harrisburg, Albany, Boston, Batimore, and Washington. From the ground, they will be visible in Bridgeport, Conn., Poughkeepsie, N. Y., and Allentown and Bethlehem in Pennsylvania, and on especially clear nights perhaps in Philadelphia, 85 miles away.

It is the hope of Col. Henry Crown, president of the Empire State Building Corp., that these fabulous shafts of light will "symbolize not only welcome—but the unlimited opportunities of America and our hopes and prayers for peace."

Certainly these lights of liberty will give blazing testimony to the achievements possible with peace and opportunity and should likewise impress the beholder with man's ultimate faith in peace and his determination to pierce the darkness of suspicion and ignorance and oppression.

FULFILLING THE MEANING OF EASTER—1956

(Radio address by Senator WILEY over Wisconsin radio stations, Easter, 1956)

Eastertime is once more at hand. And with it, the thoughts of mankind return to the triumphant scene in the Holy Land when the Master, the wayshower, proved that there is no death; that life is eternal; that the immortal spirit is triumphant over mortal flesh.

In this beautiful time of year, all of nature tells the story of life returning—in the green earth, in trees, in flowers, in every bud that soon will bloom. Our thoughts naturally turn to this question:

"How may all of us—you and I—truly fulfill the message of Easter? How may we live by the spirit of Easter—of life triumphant?"

And so, during these next few minutes, through the kind courtesy of this station, I would like to share with you some observations on the subject of applying the spirit of Eastertime—applying it in all phases of our lives—in our homes, with our families, our neighbors, our friends, in our business or shop or factory or on our farm.

WORSHIP IN THE FAITH OF OUR FATHERS

Question. Senator WILEY, how best can all of us observe this Easter season?

Answer. The answer to that is, of course, by going to the church of our beliefs and worshipping there in "the way, the truth and the life."

The answer, too, is of course, by applying not simply on Sunday, but 7 days a week, the principles of Him who came that "we might have life, and have it more abundantly."

In other words, it is obviously up to each of us really to demonstrate our creed, our faith in the spiritual nature of man—in the brotherhood of man, and the Fatherhood of God.

Question. And what of our attitude toward the problem of death itself?

THERE IS NO DEATH

Answer. Perhaps, the poet gave us the best answer—the best statement that there really is—that there really can be no death of the spirit of man, that life is truly triumphant, and right and truth.

Thus, in the poem, An Easter Carol, Phillips Brooks wrote of death and life:

"Tomb, thou shalt not hold Him longer;
Death is strong, but life is stronger;
Stronger than the dark, the light;
Stronger than the wrong, the right;
Faith and hope triumphant say
Christ will rise on Easter Day."

RISING ATTENDANCE OF CHURCHES

Question. Senator WILEY, you mentioned going to the church of our choice. What do the statistics show as regards American churchgoing?

Answer. The Gallup poll reports the welcome news that last year the American people set an all-time high church-attendance record. During an average week approximately 49½ million adults attended church.

By contrast, back in 1950 12¼ million fewer Americans attended church during the average week. On Easter Sunday last year an estimated 60½ million Americans—nearly 6 out of 10 adults—went to church.

Question. How do you interpret that statistic, Senator WILEY?

Answer. I think that the meaning is very clear. More and more Americans are recognizing that material answers do not provide the solution to our basic problems of living in this complex age—our problems of human relations. Some men's lust for wealth, their lust for power, lust for property—these are not the real keys to happiness or to peace of mind.

So, as more and more people come to understand this fact, as they come to understand the real laws of living and loving, the laws of giving and receiving, the divine law, they give of themselves to God. They turn to prayer.

Question. What else may be said about church attendance figures, Senator WILEY?

Answer. Just this. We are all naturally delighted that more and more Americans are finding inspiration and guidance in houses of worship. But, of course, we can't judge this churchgoing trend simply on the basis of big statistics. We will judge it on the inner quality of church attendance—the quality in your heart and mine, as we truly become filled with the presence of the all-knowing, all-seeing, all-powerful Creator.

As you know, just a little more than 90 million Americans list themselves as belonging to some church. That is the highest such total in our history.

If all of these Americans—if you and I—become true spreaders of the Gospel the good news of happy, fruitful, peaceful, harmonious living, then ours will be a happy country indeed. We will each find fulfillment. We will not be agitated, but will be calm, cool, and collected—the three C's—no matter what crisis may ever come.

HAPPY AMERICA AT EASTERTIME

Question. As you look about America on the Easter scene, Senator, how does the national picture look to you?

Answer. It looks excellent indeed. By almost every standard our country is enjoying more blessings of peace than ever before in our history.

Sixty-five million Americans are employed today, including 1.1 million Wisconsinites, over and above our Badger people employed in farming.

Our total national production of goods and services now approaches $400 billion. Our national income is $320 billion.

Income moreover, is fortunately better distributed among all Americans than ever before in our history. That means a better break for the little fellow in the lower income brackets.

Americans today own 250 million life insurance policies. They have $235 billion in liquid savings. Last year, Americans bought 7 million radios, 7 million television sets, 3½ million washing machines, a million air conditioners.

Today, 25 million of us own our own homes.

And 15 million of us have more than $30 billion invested for our later years in pension and retirement trust funds.

And I could go on and on with other impressive facts and figures that spell good news for the United States of America.

OUR MOST PRECIOUS ASSETS

Question. And you feel, Senator, that even more important than all these material assets is our spiritual wealth.

Answer. Of course. We could have all these possessions, all this wealth, and a lot

more besides, and still possibly not be happy, unless—I emphasize, unless—we had a true respect for the real value of life's greatest blessings—our home, our mate, our family, our fine country, our God.

OUTLOOK FOR PEACE BRIGHTER

Question. And what about the problem of peace, Senator WILEY—peace which is so sacred, especially at Eastertime. What is the outlook for peace?

Answer. I believe that the prospects for peace are getting better all the time. That doesn't mean that world communism is not still on the march. On the contrary, atheistic, aggressive communism still seeks to conquer the world—by subversion, spying, sabotage, revolution.

Question. But you apparently feel that Red Russia itself is subject to stresses and strains from within.

Answer. Absolutely. There is vast ferment inside Russia. The terrible, longstanding lies about Dictator Joseph Stalin have now been completely debunked. He is being shown up for what he was—a ruthless murderer. The iron dictatorship is giving way slowly to some new forms.

Meanwhile, the people of Russia, the enslaved people of East Germany, of Poland, the Baltic States, of the Balkans—hunger for freedom.

But communism remains a deadly menace, and we must be strong, on our guard, and vigilant.

SOME NEGATIVE FACTORS ON UNITED STATES SCENE

Question. Senator WILEY, you've mentioned the positive side, the affirmative side of America's assets and of the outlook for peace. Now, as you look around, on the American scene, itself, what do you find are some of the factors which seem too contrary to the Easter spirit—factors which we should, in the Easter spirit, try to alter?

Answer. I can list several such negative factors which all of us ought to seek to change: First, there is the matter of some disharmony in our land. I refer to occasional prejudice and bigotry, to tension and hatred, between some groups, between regions—North and South—between races and religions. Such harmful conditions are, of course, contrary to the universal teachings of the Master—who taught love and understanding among all men. "Love thy brother as thyself" He taught.

Second, there is the awful matter of crime in our country. Two million crimes are committed every year—crimes against human beings and crimes against property.

Then, there is the matter of juvenile delinquency—a million American youngsters getting into trouble with the law.

Surely, we as a civilized, Christian Nation can achieve a better record than that. Surely, we can each raise our children—through the combined influence of home, church, and school, so that our youngsters abide by the law, and so that they live worthwhile lives.

Question. Any other negative factors?

Answer. Yes, there is the matter of conflict—occasional bitter conflict between labor and management. We see, for example, the recent awful Westinghouse strike in which everybody proved to be the loser. That strike lasted 156 days—the worst in American history. It crippled a great corporation; it cost the union a fortune. It destroyed millions of dollars of workers' pay envelopes. There were irreparable losses in communities. There was unhappiness in innumerable families.

Surely, men of good will, men of reason, in labor and management, could somehow have avoided or minimized such a terrific toll. What I am saying is simply that labor and management have a responsibility to themselves and to the American public, to try to work out things better in a spirit of harmony and brotherhood and good will.

As one man put it, "Let us not try to follow your way, or my way, but God's way."

SUMMARY

Question. I know, Senator WILEY, that our listeners have been enjoying your comments on both the practical and spiritual phases of the meaning of Eastertime. Thus far, you have commented upon the great blessings enjoyed by the American people. You have mentioned the bright prospects of preserving the peace, particularly now that the Soviet Union is ridden with strife and stress. You have pointed out the encouraging factors of America's prosperity; prosperity which covers virtually all groups of America, but which, as you have pointed out on many other occasions, does not extend as yet to American farming, as it should and will.

And then you have mentioned some of the continuing problems on the American scene—problems of discord, between some groups, of crime in our midst, and juvenile delinquency. But throughout, you have stressed the spiritual aspect of the American way of life.

LO, I AM WITH YOU ALWAYS

Answer. And I would like to reemphasize the importance of that spiritual aspect. You will remember, Jesus said, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

Perhaps some of us do not realize the full significance of these words.

What the Master was saying was this, not the physical Jesus is present, but the spiritual truths He taught are available now and always to the earnest seeker.

He had told us to claim our heritage: "Be ye perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect."

This, He indicated, is not to be accomplished by blind faith, but by following in His steps—by understanding, by sound works and deeds.

He had told us to reach out and tap the source of all power. "I of mine own self can do nothing. It is the Father who worketh with Me," He had said.

Bear in mind that man, to a lesser extent had reached out and harnessed the mighty power of electricity or of the atom. But there is an infinitely greater power, a healing power, available to us all.

By following in the steps of the Man of Galilee, by fulfilling His teachings, the holy spirit will fill us with the light of inspiration, giving us continued guidance and direction.

Question. And you feel that this is a fact to be grasped throughout one's entire life and every hour of the day?

Answer. Of course. The divine law is not something to be practiced 1 day a week. Rather, it should be fulfilled throughout all our days and lives.

There is absolutely no place where we cannot follow in the Wayshower's steps—in our own home; certainly, of course, in our church; in our schoolroom; as we walk the outdoor paths of nature; in our lodge, our women's clubs, our veterans' post, as we bargain at the labor-management conference table.

Yes, those of us who are privileged to serve you in the halls of the United States Congress likewise have the heavy obligation to follow in His steps.

This, then, is the message of Eastertime. It is a message which will bring peace, which will bring harmony, which will bring fulfillment for all.

Question. I know, Senator WILEY, that your listeners have enjoyed your inspiring message today on the true meaning of Easter.

Answer. I have certainly enjoyed being with you. It would be a pleasure to get the benefit of your reactions to this broadcast.

And now may I wish for you and yours an Eastertime rich with blessings.

This is your senior Senator, ALEC WILEY, signing off from the Nation's Capital.

Barcelona Harbor, Westfield, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting the statement I made this morning in behalf of the Barcelona Harbor project, before the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE DANIEL A. REED, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 28, 1956

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely thank you and the members of your subcommittee for this opportunity to appear before you in behalf of the Barcelona Harbor project in my congressional district.

I am here to urge an appropriation for improvement of Barcelona Harbor, Westfield, N. Y.

On February 21, 1956, the President communicated with the Speaker of the House of Representatives and proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1957 for various projects, one of which is the Barcelona Harbor. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget recommended to the President that the sum of $2,260,000 be used to initiate construction of 4 authorized projects. Of that amount I believe the Army engineers have recommended that $250,000 be allocated for improvement of the Barcelona Harbor for the fiscal year 1957.

The Rivers and Harbors Act, approved March 2, 1945, adopted a project for improvement of Barcelona Harbor, N. Y., in accordance with the report contained in House Document 446, 78th Congress, providing for an entrance channel 10 feet deep with a harbor basin 8 feet deep, with breakwater protection.

The harbor is one of the authorized projects for construction of harbors of refuge on the coast of the Great Lakes for light draft vessels.

In 1945 the estimated cost of the breakwaters and dredging was $303,000, with annual maintenance estimated at $2,000, provided that local interests contribute $7,500 in cash toward the cost of the protective structures and dredging.

The local conditions were met several years ago. In July 1949, a $60,000 bond issue, needed to obtain the then estimated $791,600 in Federal aid for extensive improvements to Barcelona Harbor, was approved by the citizens of Westfield, N. Y., by a vote of 534 to 30. This was the first time in the history of Westfield that the town citizenry had been called upon to participate in a referendum authorizing a bond issue. The $60,000 bond issue was needed to contribute the necessary $7,500 in cash as well as to provide without cost to the United States, all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction of the project, including suitable spoil-disposal areas when and as required.

Assurances of local cooperation as required by law were furnished by the town of Westfield and approved by the Assistant Secretary of the Army on December 20, 1949.

In 1950 the estimated cost of the project had risen to $830,600 of which $15,600 had been allocated and expended for advanced planning of the project.

Now the estimate of the cost of construction is closer to a million dollars.

When this work is completed Barcelona Harbor will again be a harbor of refuge. Completion of this work will also mean the return of the million-dollar fishing industry to Westfield, N. Y.

Most of the fleet of 28 fishing boats formerly anchored at Barcelona Harbor in Westfield, because of the splendid fishing, were forced to move to Erie, Pa., and other places, after Barcelona Harbor became filled with sand.

Let me tell you something about Barcelona Harbor.

Barcelona Harbor was made a port of entry 125 years ago in 1831, when the Barcelona Co. laid out the area as a city on Lake Erie.

The Federal Government needed a lighthouse to protect the lake-borne commerce. Judge Trumbull B. Campbell built a beautiful stone lighthouse without cost to the Federal Government.

Judge Campbell constructed a wooden pipeline more than a mile in length to convey natural gas to furnish light to the lighthouse, at no expense to Federal Government.

A wharf was built by E. T. Foote to take care of the lively traffic by water which developed, and this wharf was built at no cost to the Federal Government.

In 1847, the increase in business was so great a larger wharf was built, costing $20,000, at no cost to the Federal Government.

Other than planning money resulting from authorization of improvement of the harbor in 1945, the United States has failed to appropriate a cent to preserve this harbor since 1838.

The citizens of Westfield have constantly done their part to maintain this harbor. They financed a large warehouse for freight inside the bar suitable for small steamers and sailing vessels, which continued to carry on a thriving waterborne trade, some of it with Canada.

Even as early as 1831 the *Western Peacock* steamboat was built by a company principally of Westfield people, the thriving village which this improvement at Barcelona Harbor will serve. This steamboat transported passengers between Buffalo and Erie.

Notwithstanding the failure of the Government to appropriate money for the harbor, the traffic to and from Barcelona held up for quite a number of years.

I cannot stress too strongly the importance to Westfield, N. Y., and its environs of the fishing industry which has been driven out of the Barcelona Harbor, because of the neglect of the Government in making the necessary improvements in the past, which improvements have now been authorized and for which I am asking you to act favorably upon the recommendations of the President and Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

A large fleet of tugs once operated out of Barcelona Harbor to the fishing grounds which lie between Barcelona and Canada. Now that these tugs cannot enter Barcelona they and their crews have been driven, together with their families, to the city of Erie, Pa., and to Buffalo, N. Y., and some even to Canada.

According to the State of New York Conservation Department, the bulk of the fish produced from New York waters of Lake Erie are taken out of two ports, Dunkirk and Barcelona. Approximately one-half of the total poundage would be taken out of Barcelona.

Barcelona has important advantages as a fishing port because it is closer to the best fishing grounds of certain times of the year, for instance the early spring fishing for whitefish and the late fall fishing for blue pike and ciscoes.

Fish production from the New York State waters of Lake Erie for 1948 was almost a million pounds and in 1946 it was 2¼ million pounds.

This harbor is needed not only to restore the fishing industry, which is a source of food and employment, but it is greatly needed as a harbor of refuge.

The storms that sweep Lake Erie are hard to describe. Spring and fall blizzards sweep through this area and within a few minutes Lake Erie can be transformed from a state of calm into roaring waves of mountainous size, in which only the strongest boats can survive.

Barcelona Harbor greatly needs improvement so that it can be a place of refuge. Moreover, when a fleet of tugs can enter and occupy the harbor they can serve as reserve ships to help save small boats caught in violent storms.

My brother was master of one of the largest ships on Lake Erie, and during his lifetime he commanded a ship 600 feet long. He encountered many of these severe storms and on one occasion on Lake Erie the smoke stack of this great ship almost dipped water, and his huge ship barely escaped capsizing.

You can readily see that the small craft which are increasing by the hundreds each year on Lake Erie need a nearby port to escape the hazards of these sudden and violent storms.

I believe that a community which has for years sought to hold its business of a great fishing industry and provide safety for its sailors through its own efforts and contributions should receive help from the Government.

The last major appropriation for Barcelona Harbor was under the River and Harbor Act of July 7, 1838, 118 years ago, in the amount of $35,466.

Barcelona Harbor is essential as a harbor of refuge. This harbor, once a thriving fishing port, should be restored. Fishing tugs with their nets and cold-storage facilities have been forced, by the filling in of this harbor with sand and silt, to either cease business or to move to other ports.

No more heroic men than those who operate the fishing tugs can be found when ships, either large or small, are in distress. When the work on this harbor is completed and they are once again able to locate there they will again be available to go to the rescue of persons and ships in distress.

I want to restore this harbor of refuge, and have these wonderful fishing tugs operate out of and in this historic port. There are several industries, especially small boatbuilding concerns, anxious to locate adjacent to this harbor when this project shall have been completed.

With completion of the improvements on the harbor, Westfield, N. Y. will again become a thriving commercial, industrial center of activity. Local hotels will find a lucrative business when small ships can use Barcelona Harbor. There will be ingoing and outgoing package freight, and excursion boats will operate from Barcelona to Erie, Cleveland, Dunkirk, Buffalo, and also to Canadian ports.

This improvement of the harbor will make it one of the popular ports for many of the hundreds of thousands of small craft in use on the Great Lakes.

When completed, Barcelona Harbor will again be a harbor of refuge and the million-dollar fishing industry will return and this will mean a rise in employment in the Westfield, N. Y. area.

Because some of the industries in my district have moved to the South, thus causing unemployment in some sections of the 43d district of New York which I represent, I am most anxious that the fishing industry be returned to Westfield.

I have been trying for many years to get an appropriation for this project and I sincerely hope you will act favorably upon the President's proposal and the budget director's recommendation concerning this project.

Discharge Petition on H. R. 11 Unnecessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a most unusual petition has been filed to discharge the House Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of Mr. PATMAN'S bill, H. R. 11. This petition seeks to force a vote on this bill on the House floor without the benefit of committee hearings.

Members of the House, and particularly those who have signed or indicated an interest in signing this petition, should be apprised of all the facts. They should know that the House Judiciary Committee scheduled hearings on this bill well prior to the filing of the discharge petition. Specifically, on February 24, 1956, I advised Representative PATMAN by letter that the House Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee would hold hearings on his bill April 18, 19, and 20, and would afford all interested parties an opportunity to testify. Some 2 weeks later, on March 12, the discharge petition was filed.

It is not only unusual, I think it is unprecedented, for a discharge petition to be filed after the chairman of a standing committee of this body announces that he is scheduling hearings on a bill.

Members should also understand the complexity and far-reaching effect of H. R. 11. Without prejudging this bill in any respect, it should be noted that it seeks to overturn a 1951 decision of the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil of Indiana case. If ever there has been a bill pending before Congress which requires careful deliberation, this is such a bill. Manifestly, it should not be voted upon by the membership of the House without benefit of committee hearings, including cross examination of witnesses, and committee recommendations.

This bill, H. R. 11, is designed to amend the antitrust laws. I think the record of the House Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee shows beyond question extreme vigilance in support of the competitive principles embodied in the antitrust laws. Never before, to my knowledge, has a discharge petition been filed on an antitrust bill.

In light of these considerations, together with the fact that intensive hearings will be held on H. R. 11 starting next week, those who have already signed the discharge petition may well wish to reconsider and withdraw their signatures.

Lines Drawn in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, as the St. Louis Post-Dispatch says in an editorial in the March 11 issue, this administration has paid the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] a high compliment in dispatching a Cabinet member to run against him. The editorial follows:

LINES DRAWN IN OREGON

The Eisenhower administration has paid Senator WAYNE MORSE a high compliment in dispatching Secretary of the Interior McKay to run against him in Oregon.

Some who regard Douglas McKay as something less than a gold-plated asset of the administration may suggest that the Oregon Democrat has really been done a favor. But it would be premature to regard Senator MORSE as a shoo-in. Clearly the administration has given the very highest political priority to the task of retiring this former Republican who committed the unforgivable sin of opposing Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1952, and then turning Democrat.

Secretary McKay is quite right in saying that the contest will amount to a showdown on the Eisenhower policies—and particularly, the Eisenhower policies on public power, conservation, and resource development which have been Mr. McKay's special province.

The people of Oregon heard those policies devastatingly criticized in 1954, and they sent the critic to the Senate in the person of RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, the first Democratic Senator from the State in 40 years. Now they will get a chance to register their sentiments on these issues, as well as many others, again.

The campaign will be watched with interest by the rest of the country because Senator MORSE has distinguished himself as one of those rare Senators who does not conform to a pattern of political orthodoxy. Like the late Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, he values his independence more than his party standing, and he therefore performs many a useful service which others neglect.

Mr. Speaker, the voters of Oregon will be called upon to evaluate Mr. McKay's record, including that in the field of conservation.

In this connection, I call your attention to the report on Preservation of National Wildlife Refuges, issued March 22 by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. That report, adopted unanimously, was critical of the administration of wildlife refuge lands by Secretary of Interior McKay.

The committee's report said that hearings held early this year revealed "a picture of extreme administrative confusion" in the Department of Interior. It declares that new oil leasing regulations for refuges, issued last December 2 by Secretary McKay, "fall far short of providing the degree of protection to the refuges which the activities of recent years prove to be necessary."

The committee report, referring to oil leases on wildlife refuge lands, declared:

Such increased activity in the issuance of leases by the Secretary of the Interior, or by those under his immediate supervision, can only result in serious damage to the wildlife refuge system in this country.

As the distinguished chairman of that committee told us Monday:

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries was most charitable to the Secretary of the Interior, the Fish and Wildlife Service, as well as to the entire Department of the Interior, because the report will absolutely show that there was chaos existing in the Fish and Wildlife Service. Administrative matters were being passed from the Secretary of the Department out into the field without the Director knowing anything about it.

The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT D. HARRISON
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it is evident to the point of being self-evident that the greatest single obstruction to rise in farm prices is the surplus that has accumulated in excess of reasonable carryover and that reduction of the surplus to manageable volume is essential to price improvement and cutting the tremendous cost of storage.

We began the major assault on that problem 2 years ago when the bill introduced by Senator SCHOEPPEL in the Senate and by me in the House of Representatives was approved on July 10, 1954, and became the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. This act has been described as the most significant agricultural legislation in the last 25 years.

On March 14, 1956, the Secretary of Agriculture reported that agreements totaling $1.2 billion have been signed for export sale of surplus United States agricultural commodities under title I of this act. The full text of the Secretary's announcement follows:

WASHINGTON, *March 14, 1956.*

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson today announced that agreements totaling $1.2 billion have been signed for export sale of surplus United States agricultural commodities, under title I of Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

This law provides for sale of commodities to friendly foreign countries for their currencies, thereby helping meet convertibility and dollar-shortage problems and facilitate export of farm surpluses.

"This represents excellent progress," Secretary Benson said. "The program was set up by the Congress for 3 years, ending June 30, 1957. The goal of $1.5 billion in export commitments was to be reached as rapidly as possible. We are pleased to be able to report that as of today, not only are actual agreements signed that total $1.2 billion but also negotiations are under way that should lead to commitments for the remainder of the allotted $1.5 billion in the near future.

"The program is having timely and helpful effect. It has given strength to our foreign and domestic markets at a time when such strength has been needed.

"Thanks in big part to the program, our agricultural exports have been able not only to hold their own in the face of increased world competition but, on a volume basis, have increased 16 percent during the past 2 years. And these gains appear to be continuing."

The $1.2 billion of title I commitments since the fall of 1954 is based on Commodity Credit Corporation value of commodities. It represents well over $900 million export value of commodities. The mark was attained this week with the signing of agreements with Chile, Korea, and Turkey.

A total of 50 agreements have been made with the following 25 countries:

Latin America (6): Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru.

Western Europe (10): Austria, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom, Yugoslavia.

Far East (7): Burma, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Korea, Pakistan, Thailand.

Middle East (2): Egypt, Israel.

It is estimated that title I agricultural exports during the current fiscal year will total from $500 million to $550 million. This would represent about one-sixth of expected total farm exports.

During the 6 months, July through December 1955, title I exports totaled about $217 million. Commitments made prior to that time have largely been carried out, except for cotton, and here it is expected that the recently announced export sales program for all upland cotton should substantially increase exports after August 1.

Commodity highlights:

Rice: Export commitments recently made or in process will virtually wipe out Government holdings of surplus milled rice resulting from 1953 and 1954 crops. Programs announced a few days ago will result in the movement of almost as much rice as the total United States rice exports in fiscal year 1955. These programs include 7,800,000 bags of rice for Indonesia and Pakistan under title I, as well as an additional 1,320,000 bags programed for Pakistan under title II of Public Law 480, administered by the International Cooperation Administration.

Wheat: The program has helped maintain United States wheat exports, despite increased foreign competition. An estimated 40 percent of all United States wheat exports are now moving as a result of title I arrangements. To date, more than 120 million bushels of wheat have been programed. Through January, 64 million bushels had been exported.

Livestock products: Yugoslavia has purchased nearly 88 million pounds of lard under the program, which has helped bolster the domestic lard market. Israel is beginning procurement of 40 million pounds of beef, recently arranged for. Programs recently signed with Spain and Korea include 28 million pounds of pork products. An agreement has been made with West Germany that includes 3 million pounds of poultry.

Vegetable oils: Since July 1955, title I agreements have included about 700 million pounds of vegetable oils. This programing has been a major factor in strengthening markets for soybeans and cottonseed.

Tobacco: Largely due to title I sales, exports of United States tobacco in 1955 exceeded the previous year by about 15 percent. Agreements with Korea and Burma represent the opening of new markets for United States tobacco. Under an arrangement with the United Kingdom, it is making an equivalent value of housing available to the United States Air Force in return for $15 million of United States tobacco.

Cotton: From July through December 1955 title I exports of 307,000 bales accounted for 40 percent of total United States cotton exports. A total of 1⅓ million bales has been programed under title I, with nearly half of this due to agreements signed during the past 6 weeks.

Fruits and vegetables: Within the last few weeks 2 program agreements have been signed providing for the sale of fruit and 1 for the sale of potatoes.

Approximate quantities of commodities included in title I agreements, Public Law 480

Commodity	Quantity	Market value	CCC cost
	Thousands	*Millions*	*Millions*
Wheat.....bushels	120,908	$208.0	$406.8
Feed grains.....do	45,418	55.4	86.9
Rice.....hundredweight	9,926	65.2	119.1
Cotton.....bales	1,302.3	238.9	238.9
Cotton linters.....do	16.7	.3	.3
Tobacco.....pounds	96,753	62.6	62.6
Dairy products.....do	89,366	19.4	33.2
Fats and oils.....do	1,022,326	153.4	161.9
Poultry.....do	3,000	1.2	1.2
Dry edible beans hundredweight	37	.3	.3
Fruits.....pounds	4,630	.5	.5
Potatoes.....hundredweight	667	1.4	1.4
Hay and pasture seed.....do	55	2.5	4.0
Meat.....pounds	81,284	25.1	25.1
Total commodities		834.2	1,142.2
Ocean transportation		75.8	75.8
Total agreements		910.0	1,218.0

Exports of Iron and Steel Scrap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much concerned in the past 3 years with the tremendous increase in the exports of iron and steel scrap. I have also found it very difficult to obtain any kind of official and reliable information as to the exports abroad of iron and steel scrap. As everyone knows, this is a very important activity to watch because we all remember that before World War II Japan, in particular, was buying iron and steel scrap in large quantities in the United States.

I have tried to obtain information from the proper departments of Government as to whether or not any of this iron or steel scrap was being resold to the Soviet Union, or anyone in the Communist-controlled countries, and the information I have received is that so far as is known, none has been resold to such countries. However, I have my doubts.

A staff member of mine has made a very careful check of the exports from the United States of iron and steel scrap during the years 1953, 1954, and 1955, as well as to the quantity shipped to the different countries abroad. The assimilation of this information required tremendous research work. It is based upon the figures of the releases from time to time by the Department of Commerce.

I enclose in my remarks a table showing the exports during the years 1953, 1954, and 1955, as well as the amounts exported to different countries. The amazing fact is in 1953 there was exported from the United States 307,673 short tons; in 1954, 1,507,310 short tons; and in 1955, 5,047,942 short tons. In other words, in a 2-year period, an increase of about 1,600 percent. I enclose in my extension of remarks the table showing the amounts exported, and to the countries that the iron and steel scrap has been exported during the calendar years 1953, 1954, and 1955, together with a copy of a letter that I have sent to Hon. Gordon Gray, Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Exports, iron and steel scrap, by countries and classes, calendar years 1953–55

[Short tons]

Country	1953	1954	1955
Samples	3,966	7,360	10,890
Canada	76,559	42,664	413,403
Mexico	156,732	225,763	276,776
United Kingdom	9,055	181,342	1,015,549
Japan	61,006	321,800	715,823
Argentina		75,381	107,876
Sweden		6,434	25,366
Netherlands		20,182	42,233
Belgium-Luxembourg	163	23,268	185,989
France		20,951	246,372
West Germany		254,893	691,891
Austria		32,031	79,521
Spain		54,492	110,600
Italy	56	178,502	1,084,582
Yugoslavia		44,130	17,161
India		4,353	1,163
Taiwan		10,362	7,840
Finland			13,022
Salvador			114
Chile			54
Union of South Africa	91		50
Norway		3,256	
Philippine Republic	36	43	19
Colombia		81	
Brazil			99
Jamaica			24
Israel		22	50
Iran			914
Hong Kong			561
Venezuela	9		
Total	307,673	1,507,310	5,047,942

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D. C., March 27, 1956.

Hon. GORDON GRAY,
Assistant Secretary of Defense, International Security Affairs, The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRAY: During the past 2 years I have been greatly disturbed by the enormous quantities of ferrous scrap that has been exported from the Port of Boston and from other ports in the United States.

Attached is a table showing the tonnages exported as revealed by statistics issued by the Department of Commerce.

You will note that the tonnages for the past 3 calendar years have been as follows:

	Short tons
Calendar year 1953	307,673
Calendar year 1954	1,507,310
Calendar year 1955	5,047,942

It will be seen that the 1954 exports were 5 times those of 1953 and the 1955 shipments were 3 times plus those of 1954 and more than 15 times those of 1953. The 1955 exports make over 50,000 freight car loads of 100 tons each. In analyzing shipments by destinations in 1955, it is found that 25 rate in this order:

Italy	1,084,582
United Kingdom	1,015,549
Japan	715,823
West Germany	691,891
Canada	413,403
Mexico	276,776
France	246,372
Belgium/Luxembourg	185,989
Spain	110,600
Argentina	107,876
Austria	79,521
Netherlands	42,233
Sweden	25,366
Yugoslavia	17,161
Finland	13,022
Taiwan	7,840
India	1,163
Iran	914
Hong Kong	561
Salvador	114
Brazil	99
Chile	54
Union of South Africa	50
Israel	50
Jamaica	24

It seems to me that the shipments to some countries are so large and unprecedented that we should be certain we are not reenacting the mistake made prior to Pearl Harbor.

Since your position is, I assume, to insure security in matters such as this and I find there may be divided responsibility as between the Department of State (including ICA), Commerce, and Defense, I would appreciate a prompt answer from you on these questions:

1. Are you convinced that there is no diversion or transshipment of this material to unfriendly countries?

2. Have you checked to insure that this material is being used for domestic purposes in the country of destination?

3. Do you consider that present export laws and regulations are adequate to protect our vital security interests in this matter?

4. Have you found cases of violations of export laws or regulations as regards these materials?

5. Do you have any recommendations with respect to amending our laws or policies regarding the export of ferrous scrap?

6. Are you convinced that responsibility over the export of scrap is sufficiently fixed as to insure adequate security? If so, where does the primary responsibility lie?

I am sure you agree that shipments of the magnitude involved in 1955 have portents worthy of review.

Very sincerely yours,
JOHN W. McCORMACK.

Air Force Submits to Saudi Arabian Anti-Christian Prejudice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, news dispatches indicate that the United States Air Force has made concessions to Saudi Arabian prejudice against Christianity in addition to tolerating anti-Jewish discrimination by Saudi Arabia.

At the Dharan Base, according to the reports, United States chaplains do not wear the insignia crosses denoting their status as Christian chaplains. This is done to avoid fanatical Moslem wrath. Catholic officials—in the interest of their personal safety—have been obliged to defrock when on a mission to the base.

Further, according to the reports, Chrisian religious services on the base are conducted with a measure of secrecy, with precautions taken to avoid arousing Moslem ire. The base figured in the news recently when Secretary of State Dulles, in response to Senate Foreign Relations Committee questioning, said that Saudi Arabia prohibited United States forces from stationing American servicemen of Jewish faith there.

One report recently heard is that the United States flag is not flown over the

base because the Saudi Arabians look upon it as an infidel symbol. A question has been raised by service personnel as to the extent of control the United States command has over the base because of the numerous reported concessions to Saudi Arabian extremism. Several weeks ago Saudi Arabia threatened to refuse renewal of the agreement under which the base is leased, thus forcing the State Department to release 18 Army tanks held up at the port of shipment because of the tense Arab-Israel situation.

This proves that prejudice cannot be confined. It becomes all pervading. First Saudi Arabia directed its prejudice against Israel merchants by boycotting them, then discrimination was extended to American citizens of Jewish persuasion, and now it embraces members of the Christian faith.

The Easter Season and the Holy Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Easter season turns my thoughts to the Holy Land and to a wonderful old lady I met there last year.

Mrs. Bertha Spafford Vester is the oldest American resident of Jerusalem, having gone there with her parents as a child in 1881.

Mrs. Vester's parents were wealthy Chicagoans who suffered a series of family tragedies and decided to go to Jerusalem to seek peace in service to the local people. With a small group of friends, they began a clinic for the poor. Jerusalem is a holy city to Christian, Jew, and Moslem, and these Americans served all three. Neither religion nor race made any difference when they found people in need.

Gradually the charities expanded until today the American colony, as it is called, operates the most modern children's hospital in the area as well as an infant welfare center and an outpatient clinic. Last year the hospital treated 623 patients; the center was visited by over 22,000 mothers bringing their babies; and the outpatient clinic treated 39,636 patients.

When Mrs. Vester came to Jerusalem as an infant, the city was a part of the old Ottoman Turkish Empire. She had lived there, raising a large family and serving the poor, through all of the troubled times since the surrender of the city to General Allenby in 1917; the stormy period of the British mandate; and the Israeli-Arab conflicts of recent years. Those who know her tell me that she has never flinched at danger nor permitted it to interfere with her impartial treatment of all who needed help.

The friends this fine American woman has made over the years are legion. Mrs. Vester is now ministering to her third generation of the sick and poor. To them she has become a symbol of the United States of America, and her generosity, courage, and enterprise are considered by them to be American characteristics.

As I met and talked with this fine lady last fall, it seemed to me that her lifetime of work as an individual American probably has accomplished more for good feeling between ourselves and the people of that area than all of the dollars and all of the propaganda we have poured into the Middle East.

Santa Fe Railroad: Misleading Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's newspaper I was impressed by a large advertisement on behalf of the Santa Fe Railroad which advertised the fact that this railroad was spending $102 million for progress in building for the great future growth in America's industry and population. This ad points out that this is the largest sum this railroad has ever budgeted for capital improvements in a single year and that the costs of these improvements were computed to $270,000 per day for 1956.

In the next portion of this ad it is stated that the largest part of this expenditure will be for 5,210 additions to the railroad's fleet of freight cars, including many of new and improved design.

In one of its most emphatic sentences, this advertisement states that all of this progress comes from Santa Fe dollars—earned dollars—not a single penny from taxes paid by taxpayers.

This advertisement is typical of the great quantity of misleading advertisement which is being disseminated to the American public about the public spirit of the corporate spending. Nowhere does this advertising tell the public the truth about the fast tax writeoff certificate which makes it possible for the railroad to pay for the great bulk of this expansion out of current income which would normally flow to the Public Treasury in the form of taxes. Through the use of the rapid amortization device, the railroad will be able to amortize this investment and siphon off its profits to this improvement during the period of the next 5 years. In this way, the railroad cars get constructed but most of the money is money that would otherwise be public tax funds.

When they tell you that this progress comes from Santa Fe's dollars—earned dollars—and not a single penny comes from taxes you pay, they are forgetting to tell you that the dollars they use are dollars short-circuited from the United States Treasury in taxes deferred and perhaps never paid.

So in the end every taxpayer is helping to contribute to the great progress of the Santa Fe this year. Let us give credits where they are due.

The Facilities of the United Nations Should Be Used in Program of Economic Aid for Underdeveloped Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I wrote to the Secretary of State suggesting that he give earnest consideration to channeling an increased percentage of funds for economic aid to other countries through the United Nations and its specialized agencies. Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include my letter to Mr. Dulles:

FEBRUARY 21, 1956.

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
The Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing you today on a matter to which I have given much thought during the past weeks. As a member of the United States delegation to the Tenth General Assembly, concerned particularly with the work of Committee II, I became convinced that the United States must soon find an effective way to help meet the aspirations of the less developed countries with respect to economic development. In meeting after meeting it was impressed upon me, and I am sure, upon the other members of the delegation, that to most of the nations in the United Nations an increase in the standard of living of their people and an improvement in their economic prospects are matters of importance far transcending most of the political issues with which their representatives deal in the United Nations.

I heartily subscribe to the declaration of the United States delegation which was forwarded to you, and I was gratified and proud that you saw fit to bring it to the attention of the President and to read it, with his permission, in a recent press conference. I believe in that declaration. I believe that we are engaged in a profound and far-reaching struggle with the Soviet Union for the loyalty and confidence of the less developed countries of the world, and I am convinced that our response to the appeal of these countries for economic aid will be a paramount factor in determining some vital decisions which they must make.

The Soviet Union, on its side, has put on a smiling mask of assumed generosity. I believe that many of the countries to which the Soviet blandishments are directed are aware of the evil designs back of these actions. But I am afraid that, in the absence of some effective measures on our part to give them the kind of help they desire, some may turn to the Soviets, either in desperation, or because they delude themselves into thinking they can accept Soviet aid while resisting Soviet penetration.

We are all fully aware of the generosity and magnitude of our aid activities in past years. As a Member of Congress, I have par-

ticipated in the framing and passage of many such measures. But in my work in the General Assembly I was struck by the extent to which many of the underdeveloped countries about which we are most concerned would prefer to be helped through the United Nations rather than to receive bilateral assistance which they may view as having "strings attached." This feeling is so strong in many cases as to amount almost to an obsession. Whether we agree with it or not, we must recognize that it exists.

I have no particular brief for the SUNFED proposal as it now exists. I recognize the disadvantages and the dangers of placing substantial sums of our tax money into a fund which might be administered irresponsibly by numerical majorities without due regard to sound economic plans. But, Mr. Secretary, I greatly fear that unless we in the United States can produce a better plan which we are willing to support and which will have enough of a United Nations impress to satisfy the underdeveloped countries, we may find ourselves in the highly uncomfortable position of standing before an accomplished fact and being forced to join an organization which we dislike or else allow it to crash down in failure, shattering with it the hopes of millions of poor people in the world.

The United States now proposes to devote $1.9 billion to economic assistance in the coming fiscal year. Would it not be worth while to consider whether we should seek some means of using a relatively small percentage of that amount through the United Nations? I have no doubt that the financial experts in the Department of State and in the other agencies of the United States Government could, if so directed, draw up a sound and workable plan for an international aid fund to be related to the United Nations and to which the United States could contribute. If this can be done, I am sure that our sponsorship of such an idea in the United Nations would meet an immediately favorable reaction in the United Nations and would win for us a spontaneous expression of appreciation comparable, perhaps, to that which greeted the atoms for peace proposal in 1953. Moreover, I believe that this would bring us far greater returns proportionately in good will and cooperation than the dollars we put into bilateral assistance.

Mr. Secretary, I hope that you will give this matter your urgent consideration. I fear that time may be running short for us in this connection. With high personal regards,

Sincerely,

BROOKS HAYS.

Independence of Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the 135th anniversary of Greek independence from the Ottoman Empire was observed on Sunday, March 25, 1956, and I am pleased again to pay homage to that land from which much of our own culture sprang. Also to participate in the more recent efforts of Americans of Greek descent to help in effectuating the union of Cyprus with Greece, the motherland.

We, as present-day American citizens, in this land of the free, cannot quite comprehend alien tyranny as being experienced by so many peoples at the present time. Yet, in spite of such tyranny, these groups have remained true to their ancient traditions, cherishing the ideal of national independence.

The world is today looking to England to see what her position will be regarding the early return to Cyprus of their recently exiled Archbishop Makarios, one of the highest church officials of the Orthodox faith on the island of Cyprus.

A famous English writer, H. G. Wells, with whom we are all familiar, said in his Outline of History that "the British acquired the island of Cyprus to which they had no right whatever and which has never been of the slightest use to them." Other English scholars and writers have similar views on enosis, which stands for the Cypriot movement aimed at the union of Cyprus with the Greek motherland. Back in 1880 Prime Minister Gladstone was sympathetic to this cause and so expressed himself, but the then Queen of England would not consent to the cession of Cyprus, and Gladstone announced that although he was very anxious for the happiness of the Cypriots he regretted he was bound by treaties which he could not break. More recently, the British press has made statements favoring the union of Cyprus with Greece and condemned the negative attitude of Prime Minister Eden and his colleagues.

All this has dampened the spirit of elation in Cyprus which is usually felt on Greek Independence Day, but we continue to hope and pray for early action that will result in self-determination for Cyprus, and for lasting peace and freedom for Greece.

An Opportunity Now for the House To Act on Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked frequently why it is that Congress apparently does nothing in meeting and discharging its responsibilities in the field of civil-rights legislation. I assume many of my colleagues have been asked the same question.

It must be admitted that the record of Congress over the years in this field has been anything but a distinguished one.

No one, except an extreme partisan, would question the proven fact that the executive departments have made substantial and significant contributions in implementing an excellent civil rights program.

Few, whose opinions are respected, would challenge the progress made in the judicial department and particularly by the Supreme Court of the United States and of the other Federal courts in defining and upholding the civil rights of American citizens.

But Congress, which has now and has had many vital phases of legislation in this field confronting it, seems to all too many of those to whom it is responsible to have been indifferent, inept, or lacking in courage.

It is of little use to point out that congressional procedures are usually, and in many cases wisely, slow.

It is of as little use to call attention to the number of bills which have been filed in this field over the years by Members of Congress as to the number of hearings and even reports by congressional committees.

It is of no value at all to try to explain why it is that any real results have been delayed, obstructed, and even prevented by a very few having the power to do that or by such parliamentary devices as filibusters.

But now, next month, the House will have the opportunity of direct action in this field if a bare majority of the Members wish to exercise their undoubted right to demand it.

H. Res. 440 and H. Res. 441 were filed respectively by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON] on March 21.

These are identical resolutions providing for the consideration of H. R. 627.

Each provides for recognition for the consideration of H. R. 627, a bill described as follows:

To enact national policy to protect the right of the individual to be free from discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin. Establishes a five-man Commission on Civil Rights, appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate, to gather information and report to the President on what activities affect civil rights. Authorizes a full-time staff director. Creates a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice under an Assistant Attorney General. Creates a 14-man Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights. Amends and supplements existing civil-rights statutes; provides additional criminal penalties and gives the United States district courts concurrent jurisdiction with State courts to enforce civil actions against offenders (amending U. S. C. 18, sec. 13).

These resolutions were referred to the Rules Committee and, of course, can be reported by that committee.

However, if there is no action by that committee by the time this House reconvenes on April 9, it will be in order, under the rules, to file a discharge petition and this will be done. This petition will become effective once it is signed by a majority of the Members of the House. Therefore, whatever actions may be taken by others and irrespective of the reasons assigned for such actions, each individual Member of the House will have his clear opportunity early next month of becoming a part of the majority of the House demanding that it be given an opportunity to express its own judgment and convictions in this field of civil-rights legislation.

It is important to note that 218 signatures are construed to be a majority within the purview of the rule, that additional signatures are not admitted after

the requisite number have been affixed, and that when a majority of the membership has signed the discharge petition, the motion, generally known as the petition, is printed in the RECORD, entered in the Journal and referred to the Calendar of Motions to discharge committees.

It may be suggested that this discharge petition procedure is usually futile. It must be conceded that this is a fact.

But the exceptions are notable.

Many Members feel quite reasonably that the procedure should not be utilized unless there have been full hearings on the proposed legislation and a clear situation exists making it practically certain that this House as a whole will be deprived of its opportunity to pass upon such proposed legislation unless that procedure is invoked. If the Rules Committee decides not to take affirmative action upon either of these discharge rules by the time Congress returns from the recess, both conditions will be satisfied beyond any possibility of question.

It may also be suggested that consideration of H. R. 627 and action by this House on it may be frustrating because no one can guarantee the necessary further action. That, too, may become a fact; but if so, it will be one over which no Member of the House has any control. And the responsibility for it becoming a fact will be understood by everyone concerned as to the imperative need of congressional action at this time in the field of civil rights.

These are the facts which confront this House now.

I want to conclude with a reference to the brief remarks in the RECORD of March 21, at pages 5298 and 5299, which accompanied the introduction of House Resolution 440 and House Resolution 441.

I know that there has been some evidence of an inclination toward partisanship with reference to the consideration of H. R. 627 by this House. Any examination of the remarks in the RECORD which I have cited will contradict any such resort to partisanship and should prevent its recurrence while the matter is before this House.

That any such reference is not only unjustified but also completely inaccurate is proven beyond any possible doubt by the statements that these resolutions were filed, as the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] said, as "representing a very large group," and, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON], said, "in behalf of Members of the House on both sides of the aisle who have been meeting sincerely and earnestly in an attempt to work out with the Attorney General a thoughtful legislative solution to some of the civil-rights problems which face us" and "as a constructive step in the direction of making sure that the membership of this House will have a full opportunity to express themselves in connection with this problem of curtailment of civil rights." The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] stated the undeniable fact when he said that "Mr. ROOSEVELT and Mr. BROWNSON have by their remarks indicated that this is an issue stripped of partisan politics." The good reputation of this House, in the judgment of an overwhelming majority of the American people, will be enhanced if the issue remains divorced from partisan politics and if a strong majority of the Members insist upon the right of individual Members to express themselves in this field of legislation as to which it has an absolute and unqualified responsibility.

Railroad Retirement Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a statement which I recently submitted to the Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. This statement was in support of H. R. 3087 which is similar to my own bill, H. R. 8828. H. R. 3087, introduced by Congressman CHARLES BENNETT, of Florida, proposes three ways of liberalizing railroad retirement benefits. My statement, which follows, explains its provisions:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT C. BYRD, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, SIXTH WEST VIRGINIA DISTRICT, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS, HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to testify here today in favor of H. R. 3087, introduced by Congressman BENNETT of Florida. I have introduced a similar bill, H. R. 8828. This bill proposes three ways of liberalizing railroad retirement benefits. It provides, first, retirement at age 60 with 30 years of service, or with 35 years of service regardless of age. Secondly, it provides for computation of credit for service prior to January 1, 1937, on the basis of the five highest years rather than on the basis of average earnings for the years 1924–1931. Thirdly, it provides a 15 percent increase across the board to pensioners, annuitants, and survivors.

Reducing the retirement age after many years of service is necessary to care for those who lose their railroad positions at advanced ages, but before they have reached 65. Perhaps 65 as a retirement age is not a great hardship on rail employees who can remain in their employment until attaining that age, but it does seem that Congress should attempt to give some relief to employees who, through no fault of their own, lose their position a few years before becoming 65.

The Railroad Retirement Act was established in 1934 to deal with the hazards within the industry, and there is no greater hazard which can confront a worker today than to lose one's job late in life after many years of faithful service to the employer of his choice. This has happened to a large group of shop employees in the past. Those employees were deprived of their living. They have used up their unemployment insurance, sold their savings bonds, depleted their savings, and they are desperate when they must take a reduced pension because they are not 65 years of age. There is another class of employees who are interested in this provision—those who are in poor health and cannot qualify for a disability pension under the present act. This class would gladly retire, and it would be in the interest of all concerned if employees in this condition were availed of the opportunities for earlier retirement.

The elimination of the test period 1924–1931 is another provision of this bill that is very important to all railway employees who had service with the rail lines prior to 1937 when the present act became law. The using of this period to determine annuities brings in the depression years of 1929–1930, when some of the railway employees were only working a few days per month, and using this as a basis is the reason why only a little more than 1 percent today qualify for the maximum annuity or pension of $165.60 per month. A precedent has been established by social security in which the 4 highest years are used. H. R. 3087 would substitute the 5 highest years in lieu of this low earning period which has no relation to our present economy. There are over 60 million workers today in this country, and I say without fear of contradiction that none of them work at the level of earnings they made in the years 1924–1931. Every railway employee who retires before 1967 will have to use prior service credits, and this feature alone accounts for the fact that few retired railway workers have any conception of what their annuities will be until they retire and the sad news is broken to them by the Railroad Retirement Board.

The 15 percent increase would benefit all annuitants and pensioners. This would be of general help in the financial problems faced by all retired rail employees. Most of the retired people who are trying to live on a pegged income of a pension today find it very hard to cope with the high prices, and they learn that their pension dollars buy so little. In 1951 the last increase was made in their rail pensions and annuities. Several increases have been granted members of the various labor crafts during this interim. Retired railroaders feel that they are the forgotten creatures who contributed generously toward the national economy while employed in the heyday of their working career. They look forward, most hopefully, to this Congress for relief from an intolerable situation.

Thank you again, Mr. Chairman, for permitting me to appear here today in behalf of the measure introduced by Congressman BENNETT. In introducing a similar bill, I recognized the need for such legislation, and I sincerely hope that your distinguished committee will be able to act favorably upon H. R. 3087.

President Eisenhower Holds Important Conference With President Cortines, of Mexico, and Prime Minister St. Laurent, of Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, there is no act of the administration in recent months that can so readily produce good will and beneficial results of a lasting character than the invitation of President Eisenhower to meet with President Adolpho Ruiz Cortines, of Mexico, and Prime Minister St. Laurent, of Canada.

The purpose of this meeting held at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., at the

famous Greenbrier Hotel, was to discuss in a friendly and informal manner problems and conditions that affect the welfare of the three great nations of the North American Continent. This important gathering could mean much to the future security and well-being of not only the three nations involved, but also to the entire Western Hemisphere.

The holding of this important meeting at this little village in the Allegheny Mountains is not the first time that this has been the site for important gatherings. It has entertained 13 Presidents in its time. But, this was the first time that the President of Mexico, the Prime Minister of Canada and our own President have met either there or elsewhere in a joint conference.

Notwithstanding the importance of many other conferences that have been held in this beauty spot of America, never has there been one so full of possibilities as this present one. It is my opinion that it is long overdue. It seems as if we have heretofore looked upon the far-off nations of the world as our chief concern. Our national wealth has been poured out lavishly upon all of them, large and small, in an effort to strengthen them in their economy, as well as militarily. All of this has given the appearance that these distant nations are more important to our welfare and security than the nations of Mexico and Canada, our immediate neighbors to the south and north of us. Furthermore, it has seemed that we were taking the friendship of Canada and Mexico for granted. While there is every reason to consider that these two nations are our friends in the truest sense of the term, and while it is not necessary to buy their friendship, as we seem to be trying to do elsewhere in the world, yet, it is a great mistake to take them for granted, not because they would ever become other than friends, but because they are our friends. These two nations, Mexico and Canada, have been, and will continue to be, our friends. It is because of this unadulterated friendship that we owe them a greater degree of appreciation and acknowledgment than we have shown in the past.

Thus, it comes with a feeling of satisfaction that we have at last recognized the friendship of these two great nations to the north and south of us. And it is particularly gratifying that this recognition comes on our highest level, namely, the President of our Nation. It is fitting that it be so.

We are all much more aware of the economic ties that bind us to Canada than we are to those that bind us to Mexico. This may be the reason that we have not always seemed as anxious to recognize our obligation to create trade conditions between Mexico and ourselves that would be mutually helpful to both.

Without any intention to discount the favorable trade relations that exist between our Nation and that of Canada, which it is a pleasure to recognize, yet, because of a general lack of knowledge of the facts underlying our trade relationships with Mexico, it seems appropriate to make some reference to them as a justification of the reason that has impelled President Eisenhower to include Mexico with Canada in a consideration of affairs that are pertinent to our mutual welfare.

An examination of our trade statistics reveals that Mexico is the fourth largest purchaser of United States products in the entire world, and the first in all of Latin America. It is buying $1.60 worth of United States products for each $1 worth of Mexican products bought by the United States from Mexico. As an illustration, it is astounding to realize that Mexico's sugar industry alone is buying more than $7 worth of United States products for each $1 worth of Mexican sugar bought by the United States. Altogether, the purchase of United States products by Mexico is the fourth largest among all the nations of the world. It is exceeded only by Canada, United Kingdom, and Japan. Furthermore, a further examination of United States public records shows that Mexico's purchases enrich the economy of every State in the Union.

It is highly desirable that these little known facts of Mexico's trade relations with the United States be given the fullest consideration as a result of the joint conference recently held. The favorable results that can be obtained as a result of strengthening the ties that bind the United States, Canada, and Mexico together can be of incalculable benefit, not only to each of the participating nations, but also in promoting the economy and security of the whole Western Hemisphere.

The Negro and the Destiny of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, consent is requested to include in the RECORD the following address, which I made over the NBC network on Thursday, March 15, 1956, on the occasion of Newspaper Week, sponsored by the National Newspaper Publishers Association. The address follows:

With each of the participants on this broadcast, I share a deep feeling of responsibility in being invited to express views on a matter crucial to American welfare. The press is the pulse of the life of any democratic nation and its expressions record the beat and ebb of that life.

There is a gripping tie between this matter of freedom of the press and its functions and the destiny of the Negro and democracy. Despite those who would deny it, we need only glance through any American newspaper to become certainly informed that the Negro and democracy's destiny, entwined for some 300 years, has come to the inevitable crisis. Whether or not democracy will arise from its bed of crisis and live to walk among the free people of this earth and strengthen itself by drawing to it the uncommitted peoples who form three-fourths of the world's population, depends upon the choices it makes today and in the months ahead concerning the Negro and the pattern of human relations it adopts with them and, consequently, takes to itself.

From the freeing of the slaves through the executives proclamations and judicial and legislative mandates of our day, Negroes have taken their battle for freedom always to the law of the land embodied in the Constitution. This is why America's pattern of human relations applying to Negro citizens is of such concern to the rest of the world. They know that this pattern is evidence of the legal operation of the laws of democracy.

Negroes ask for such things as the right to vote, protection from mob violence, the opportunity to obtain education, employment, and housing without facing bars based solely upon color of skin. The answer of those who hesitate to make their choice in favor of democracy has been that most of these are guaranties already existing in our Constitution and the case law of the Nation. This may well be true, but many of these guaranties as now spelled out are ambiguous and capable of interpretation which is guided by personal bias and interest.

At this crisis in American human relations, we are in a general election year. Daily events communicate to the world through national and international press that 300 years is too long for a democratic nation to tolerate slavery or subjugation in any degree and now a choice of principles must be made. The representatives and guardians of the American way of life—politicians in their partisan activities in executive chambers and legislative halls—have no alternative but to uphold the democratic form of government or reject it in the face of the world. There is no middle course when one has arrived at the point of fundamentals. They choose a course of no return when, as representatives, they deny the requests for legislation to correct abuse of democratic principles and enforce its concepts. Our newspapers, the white and the Negro press, have made it certain that the vast majority of Americans know these requested mandates are necessary and needed now. The Democratic Party has been the leader of democracy's cause, but it is now subjected to legitimate criticism because of equivocating actions of some of its present leaders. The Republican Party, although pursuing the course of action initiated by its predecessors, is certainly not being creative in the field of civil rights and is not following through vigorously with the kind of leadership that the executive branch can follow; nor have their congressional responsibilities been fulfilled. These responsibilities must be fulfilled as representatives of our form of government chart America's destiny in the next few months as a democratic nation and a leader of men of the world. Those affected and concerned with civil rights should keep this in mind and withhold support from any individual candidate, regardless of his party, who fails to take a positive stand on this vital issue.

Present Administration Policies Swiftly Forcing Ruination of Small Independent Farmers, the Backbone of Our Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following statistics which indicate the facts that the

farm population is decreasing and that the size of the farm is greatly increasing in the State of Oklahoma. These authentic statistics which I have secured indicate that not only one county but every county in the State of Oklahoma has suffered.

The present administration or any administration owes it to the present populace of our Nation and to posterity to protect the tiller of the soil, the backbone of our national economic life:

Change in size and number of farms, 1950–54

County	Change in number of farms (percent)	Change in average size (percent)
1. Adair	−17.1	+20.3
2. Alfalfa	−14.6	+13.0
3. Atoke	−20.4	+18.0
4. Beaver	−6.9	+12.4
5. Beckham	−16.5	+11.4
6. Blaine	−12.7	+17.7
7. Bryan	−18.1	+25.0
8. Caddo	−20.4	+27.7
9. Canadian	−11.5	+12.4
10. Carter	−19.5	+22.2
11. Cherokee	−22.6	+3.9
12. Choctaw	−24.2	+37.9
13. Cimarron	−9.3	+9.8
14. Cleveland	−21.9	+13.6
15. Coal	−25.8	+35.4
16. Comanche	−12.9	+5.0
17. Cotton	−11.8	+13.7
18. Craig	−15.2	+14.2
19. Creek	−28.5	+35.3
20. Custer	−13.9	+18.0
21. Delaware	−18.1	+14.8
22. Dewey	−15.3	+15.2
23. Ellis	−13.6	+11.3
24. Garfield	−11.3	+14.6
25. Garvin	−16.7	+8.7
26. Grady	−19.9	+24.9
27. Grant	−6.8	+10.2
28. Greer	−20.8	+18.0
29. Harmon	−15.6	+11.7
30. Harper	−14.7	+18.5
31. Haskell	−25.2	+32.6
32. Hughes	−19.4	+21.6
33. Jackson	−3.6	+14.5
34. Jefferson	−23.3	+28.4
35. Johnston	−23.6	+26.9
36. Kay	−12.8	+12.3
37. Kingfisher	−16.2	+16.9
38. Kiowa	−12.2	+16.3
39. Latimer	−7.7	+19.7
40. LeFlore	−17.6	+23.6
41. Lincoln	−16.2	+15.1
42. Logan	−4.3	+8.4
43. Love	−18.9	+18.5
44. McClain	−11.0	+20.2
45. McCurtain	−22.1	+27.0
46. McIntosh	−26.3	+39.2
47. Major	−4.1	+6.6
48. Marshall	−18.3	0
49. Mayes	−15.1	+10.2
50. Murray	−15.5	+10.9
51. Muskogee	−17.1	+15.9
52. Noble	−8.5	+12.3
53. Nowata	−17.3	+16.2
54. Okfuskee	−22.3	+25.3
55. Oklahoma	−14.2	+14.7
56. Okmulgee	−18.7	+31.8
57. Osage	−11.2	+3.8
58. Ottawa	−22.0	+23.2
59. Pawnee	−9.1	+11.4
60. Payne	−10.3	+12.8
61. Pittsburg	−16.5	+18.0
62. Pontotoc	−13.7	+31.0
63. Pottawatomie	−19.1	+20.3
64. Pushmataha	−21.8	+22.4
65. Roger Mills	−9.2	+4.9
66. Rogers	−4.9	−5.0
67. Seminole	−26.6	+33.7
68. Sequoyah	−15.2	+13.2
69. Stephens	−8.2	+7.2
70. Texas	−8.3	+6.7
71. Tillman	−17.9	+20.9
72. Tulsa	−30.6	+62.1
73. Wagoner	−15.8	+25.9
74. Washington	−27.4	+26.2
75. Washita	−13.4	+14.4
76. Woods	−9.9	+13.8
77. Woodward	−8.8	+17.0
State	−16.4	+20.3

NOTE.—Acres of land in farms in the State decreased 1.05 percent between 1950 and 1954.

Source: 1954 Census of Agriculture, U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Appointment of Maj. Gen. Garrison H. Davidson as Superintendent of USMA at West Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the people of First Congressional District of Kansas have always deemed ourselves most fortunate to have the illustrious Command and General Staff College of the United States Army situated at Leavenworth, Kans. To this famous school of military learning come the keenest minds of our own Army and its sister services and those of other great nations allied with us in the cause of freedom. From the college over the years have graduated the great military leaders of the past century: MacArthur, Eisenhower, Patton, Bradley, and a host of other distinguished field commanders.

It is only fitting that this school be led by men of stature and vision. This requirement has, of course, been seen to in the past by the Army Chief of Staff who has unfailingly sent only the finest men to be commandants of the college. In all fairness to those who have gone before, I submit that the present Commandant, Maj. Gen. Garrison Holt Davidson, must be counted among the very best. My remarks this morning are taken upon the recent announcement that General Davidson, after excellent service since July 1954, is about to depart from the Command and General Staff College to become Superintendent of the United States Military Academy at West Point. We are reluctant, indeed, to see this outstanding officer leave our midst in Kansas, but we rejoice in the fact that he has been selected to lead the long gray line in which he himself once stood many years ago as a cadet.

Garrison H. Davidson was born in the Fordham section of New York City on April 24, 1904, and graduated from the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., with a bachelor-of-science degree on June 14, 1927, when he was appointed a second lieutenant in the Corps of Engineers. His initial assignment was as assistant football coach at the Academy in September 1927. From then until the fall of 1930, he alternated between coaching at the Academy each fall and service as a platoon leader with the 1st Engineers at Fort Du Pont, Del., and Camp Dix, N. J. After the 1930 football season he remained at the Academy as an instructor in the Department of Natural and Experimental Philosophy, doubling as assistant football coach each fall.

In October 1932, when still a second lieutenant, he was chosen as head football coach at the United States Military Academy. He is the youngest to have held that position in which he remained until June 1938.

In July 1938, he was transferred to Hawaii for duty. He commanded a company of the 3rd Engineers, Schofield Barracks, for a year and served as assistant G–4 of the Hawaiian Division his second year there. In July 1940 he was detailed as airbase engineer, Hamilton Field, Calif.

In January 1941 he was detailed to duty in Washington, D. C., with the construction division of the Office of the Chief of Engineers and was assigned staff supervision over the near billion dollar program of construction and expansion of the ports and supply depots throughout the United States in preparation for World War II. He served in this capacity until September 1942 when he was named executive officer to the engineer of the Western Task Force, which invaded North Africa under General Patton 2 months later. In November 1942 he became General Patton's engineer in the First Armored Corps in the North African Theater of Operations and served in that capacity in North Africa and later when the corps became the Seventh Army on D-Day in Sicily.

Commenting on the performance of the engineer troops in Sicily, General Eisenhower stated:

> Only through the engineers has the end of the campaign come so quickly.

At the close of the Sicilian campaign, military insignia not being available locally, General Patton pinned a pair of his own stars on him, when at the age of 39 he became one of the youngest general officers in the ground forces.

During the month following General Patton's departure from the Seventh Army and prior to General Patch's arrival he "commanded" the Seventh Army, then a planning headquarters. In this capacity he was called on during this period to recommend the area of Southern France into which the assault from the south should be launched. He named the area between Cavalaire and Agay on the Cote d'Azur which was not changed during the months of further study and planning that followed and where the assault was made 4 or 5 months later. He continued as army engineer under General Patch throughout the campaign in France and Germany.

Of the performance of the engineer troops in the landing in southern France and the pursuit of the German forces up the Rhone Valley to the Vosges, General Patch commented:

> The engineer support of the operation of the Seventh Army was the highlight performance of the Army.

He pinned the Distinguished Service Medal on him in Saverne, Alsace-Lorraine.

In July 1945, he became president of the first German War Crimes Commission in which capacity he conducted the first mass trial of German war criminals at Darmstadt, Germany, preceding the Nuremberg trials. In August 1945, he was appointed engineer of the ETO force commanded by General Patton.

In March 1946, back in the United States he was assigned to Headquarters, Sixth Army, as engineer. In September

1947 Gen. Mark Clark appointed him as his chief of staff. He continued in that capacity after General Wedemeyer took command.

In August 1950, he was assigned to the Eighth Army in Korea, and appointed Assistant Division Commander of the 24th Division. While serving in this capacity he commanded several task forces notably one which eliminated the last North Korean penetration of the Naktong bridgehead north of Anju on the Chongchon River against which the first Chinese intervention was stopped in the first week of November 1950. In February 1951, he was assigned to Headquarters Eighth Army and designated to supervise the construction of several defense lines, notably the defensive line north of Seoul against which the Chinese operation of April 1951 piled up and was stopped. In May 1951 he was appointed Acting Chief of the Korean Military Advisory Group in which capacity he served until July 10, when he returned to the Zone of the Interior.

Since July 1951, he served the Weapons System Evaluation Group in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. In July 1954, General Davidson was named Commandant of the Command and General Staff College and has won our unqualified respect and admiration since that time.

He was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal, the Commendation Ribbon with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Presidential Unit Citation, the Legion of Honor—French—Croix de Guerre—French—Commander, Order of the British Empire, and the Korean Presidential Unit Citation.

General Davidson wears 13 battle stars; 7 of World War II and 6 from the Korean campaign. He also wears the Bronze Arrowhead for assault landings at Fedala, French Morocco; Gela in Sicily; and St. Tropes in southern France.

Perhaps it is only indicative of the quality of the man and the high esteem in which General Davidson is held by his superiors to note that at 39 he was the youngest brigadier general in the United States Army.

We, the people of the First Congressional District of Kansas, wish General Davidson every happiness and success in his new assignment and in the fine future that must certainly be in store for him in the Army.

Guaranteeing Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in the 10 years since I first came to the Congress I have been pleased to see—and to help bring about—a remarkable improvement in the status of civil rights. As we look back on these 10 years we cannot avoid being deeply impressed by how much has happened to remove inequities and inequalities and to bring about a more healthy society in our democracy. During that time we have seen some of our own cities and States do exactly what we have maintained should be done nationally—and that is set up fair-employment practices and antidiscrimination agencies. And, nationally, the courts have been instrumental in bringing about some far-reaching changes in the American scene.

But this progress has not always been steady. There have been ups and downs. There have been periods of retrogression. It is my feeling we are in such a period right now. The tensions which have been building up in some areas, stimulated by those who refuse to conform to the law or who seek to delay the application of the law, have already led to some serious and even tragic consequences.

I am not taking the position here in the House that these issues are easily solved or can be met merely by words. But there is a need for speaking out on this subject, to demonstrate that those who oppose progress in civil rights are not in truth the voice of the American people or of the Congress.

Also, however, there is a need for action. Action has been too long delayed. That is why I have proceeded to introduce bills to assure greater adherence to and protection for the civil rights of the American people of whatever color or creed.

The greatest ally we have in the fight for full civil rights is that great instrument which was drafted in my city of Philadelphia, the Constitution of the United States. As has been said, the Constitution is colorblind. It applies equally to all. It is the rock of our freedom. It cannot be set aside by States acting on their own or by individuals who set up their own views or prejudices to be above the requirements and principles of the Constitution.

In this respect, the courts, as I said, have done a remarkable job in interpreting the Constitution in this field of civil rights. But the courts do not act in a vacuum. Cases must be brought. They must be fought up through the lower courts. They must present clear-cut constitutional issues in order to reach the highest court for final determination.

I am deeply proud that in the years of the Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman administrations the Department of Justice of the United States was always in the forefront in bringing civil-rights cases up through the courts to the Supreme Court.

In the past few years some people seem to have closed their eyes to some of the most glaring incidents of violation of civil rights. The Till case is a good example. There have been others. We read that in some States spiritual successors of the days of the lynch mob and the fiery cross are now busily at work whipping up hatred for the Negro.

Let us not for a moment fool ourselves that achieving integration in the schools can be accomplished if this hatred is allowed to go on unchecked and unchallenged. The excesses of the few must be stopped by law and by order—and by decency.

There is a role here for the churches. There is a role here for local law and order, and for State law, and for national justice. There is much which has to be done. But fundamentally, we must see to it that the rabble rouser or the fanatic or the lawless mobster cannot defy the laws of this country or of God.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, while we need tolerance and moderation and understanding and all the other things which go with accomplishing social change smoothly and effectively, we also need the authority of law and the punishment—swift and sure—of those who flagrantly defy the law.

Let us enforce the laws we have to protect the individual. If local appointees and elected officials will not or cannot enforce those laws to protect the individual, then the States must step in; and if they fail, then the Federal Government must exercise its responsibilities under the Constitution to guarantee the rights of the individual.

If more laws are needed, let us pass them. I have introduced the so-called civil-rights package of proposed laws which are intended to nail down and make clear the responsibilities of the Federal Government in this field, but it seems to me that effective and active and vigorous enforcement of laws now on the books would go a long way toward resolving the issue.

How can it be that a boy can be kidnaped and murdered but no one is convicted of a crime, such as happened in the Till case? How does it happen that Negroes can be shot and killed in some areas but the person who wields the gun is found innocent of wrongdoing on the plea of self-defense against, for instance, an unarmed Negro?

Cases of this kind help to bring about a condition in which hate groups can flourish, because the haters develop a defiance of law and feel that they are immune from punishment in their mob activities against Negroes.

As one who has voted for and supported antilynch, anti-poll-tax, and FEPC bills, and who believes in their principles, I call upon this country to act now to end these terrible incidents by prompt and decisive policies to guarantee civil rights for all.

Statement by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson Submitted to the House Committee on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the statement made by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson on H. R. 12 to the House

Committee on Agriculture on Tuesday, March 27, 1956:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in response to your request of March 16 I am glad to review for you the President's recommendations in general and the pending agricultural bill, H. R. 12, as it was passed by the Senate a week ago. It is my earnest hope that when the bill comes before the House and Senate for final action we will have a measure that will truly serve the best interests of American agriculture. This is the hope of the great majority of people who are genuinely concerned with the well-being of those who live on our Nation's farms. But time is running short. Already it is so late that it would be difficult to put the soil bank fully into operation so as to help farmers this year. There remains much to be done to shape the bill into the kind of legislation now required to deal effectively with agriculture's difficult problems. That is the challenge which confronts the House and Senate conferees as they work on the bill, already too long delayed.

We in the Department of Agriculture want to assist Congress in every way possible in speedily developing and implementing legislation which is sorely needed by farmers now. It is getting late. Many 1956 crops have already been planted or soon will be planted. It is imperative that Congress act quickly.

Remedial farm legislation has been placed high on this administration's priority list. You will recall that on January 9 President Eisenhower sent his farm program message to Congress. It made specific recommendations for raising agricultural income and advancing the security of our farm families. Then on January 12, my staff and I appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to discuss the President's recommendations in detail. In its deliberations the Senate committee freely called upon Department staff members for help, and all of us were glad to provide this assistance. Legislation was introduced in the House of Representatives embodying practically all of the President's recommendations shortly thereafter. Representative HOPE introduced H. R. 8543, and Representative HILL introduced H. R. 8544 on January 17. Then on February 10, nearly a month after the President's message, the Senate committee reported out its bill S. 3183. You will recall that I appeared before your committee on February 21, and members of my staff appeared on February 22 and 23 to discuss with you the farm situation and the need for legislative action. On February 27 in response to your request we submitted the legislative languange that would put the President's recommendations into effect. This later appeared as a committee print. In addition, you are familiar with the general subject from the Senate debate on S. 3183 which is now embodied in H. R. 12.

In making recommendations, we feel that there are certain fundamentals which must be fully recognized if we are to have a sound agricultural program. Among these are:

1. A Government warehouse is not a market.

2. Large stocks of commodities in Government hands depress prices.

3. Emphasis on outlets for the surplus and preventing the buildup of new surpluses must go hand in hand.

4. In the best interests of farmers we must reduce rather than increase Government regulations and controls.

Since the end of the shooting war in Korea we have seen how farm income has been falling off while our agricultural surpluses were piling up. This took place in spite of the very programs that we have had in operation to support farm income. Thus it is now clearly apparent that a sound program for farmers must have in it the means to take off their backs the price depressing surpluses which are dragging down farm income. This drag on farm income is at the rate of $2 billion per year. The program transmitted to Congress by the President is designed to improve farm income and help relieve this surplus situation. It will help primarily through the soil bank—the acreage reserve and the conservation reserve programs.

The question has been raised as to whether the Department of Agriculture had authority to operate the soil bank program as proposed by the President without any new legislation. This has been carefully reviewed by our legal staff and the answer is that there are definite legal reasons for the necessity of new legislation. In order that there may be no misunderstanding, I wish to make clear that if Congress had provided the authority this soil bank program would be in operation right now. This program is of such importance and means so much to the welfare of agriculture that each day's delay in granting the needed legislative authorization is costing our farmers badly needed income.

I should like to review briefly our major recommendations which are covered in the draft of a bill which we submitted a month ago in accordance with your request. These recommendations are:

First is the soil bank which consists of two parts—the acreage reserve and the conservation reserve.

Acreage reserve program: This recommended program would authorize the Secretary to compensate producers for reducing their 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959 crops of wheat, cotton and rice below their respective acreage allotments. It should be noted that there is special legislation with respect to these commodities such as minimum acreage allotments which prevent the adjustment of supply to normal levels. As a result of these minimum provisions in the law the 1956 acreage allotment for wheat is 36 million acres more than needed to adjust supplies to normal; cotton is 11 million acres above, and rice is 700,000 acres in excess. The acreage reserve program will help compensate for this needed adjustment, and assist in getting supplies back to normal levels.

In adjusting to their allotments, producers of these three commodities diverted a substantial part of the acreage taken out of production into feed grains. As a result, the 1954 and 1955 production of oats, barley, and grain sorghums increased about 800 million bushels, corn equivalent by weight. This led to the substitution of other feed grains for corn, a build-up of the corn carryover, and unrealistically low allotments for corn. The law prescribes the manner of establishing corn acreage allotments.

Against this background of minimum allotments for other basics and reduced corn acreage allotments resulting from the diverted acreage problem, it is only fair to provide for corn an acreage reserve program with payment for adjustments from the 1953–55 average acreage. Corn does not have these minimum allotment provisions. Corn producers cannot shift into production of basics covered by marketing quotas. Corn producers have been hurt by the feed grain production on acres diverted from other basics. This recommended program is just simple justice. A realistic corn acreage reserve program as proposed will bolster feed grain and livestock prices. This will be a great step forward. It is basic and constructive for the feed-livestock economy, out of which comes 5 out of every 8 dollars of farm receipts.

This acreage reserve program has been budgeted at $750 million, for the first year.

Conservation reserve program: With this program we hope to shift millions of acres from cropland to forage, trees or water storage. This is a long-range adjustment program designed to eliminate from cropping the less productive lands and some of the diverted acres. Payments would be made for establishment of suitable cover and annual rental payments would be made for a specified number of years. Thus, there would be income from these acres and reduced feed grain supplies would be translated into higher market prices for grains and livestock. This program has been budgeted at $350 million for the first year.

Another factor in a sound agricultural economy is the availability of adequate credit to farmers at all times. The importance of this was emphasized by the President in his farm message and we have made the following recommendations to bring about the desired credit situation for our farmers:

1. Authorize real estate loans to owner-operators of family type farms for refinancing of debts.

2. Authorize real estate and operating loans under titles I and II of the Bankhead Act on less than adequate farms where satisfactory off-farm income is to be available.

3. Increase the aggregate amount of insured loans for a fiscal year from $100 million to $125 million.

4. Eliminate the present limitation on insured loans of not exceeding 90 percent of the fair and reasonable value of the farm, thereby placing the insured loans and direct loans under title I on the same basis.

5. Eliminate the requirement that loans may not be made in excess of the average value of efficient family-type farm management units in the county, thereby making it possible to serve any family-type farm operator who is otherwise eligible for credit services under the act.

6. Provide that, not to exceed 10 percent of the annual appropriation for operating loans under title II may be used for loans in excess of $10,000 but in no event in excess of $20,000.

7. Permit in justifiable cases, due to causes beyond the borrower's control, outstanding loans to be renewed or extended for a period not to exceed 10 years and also authorize the agency to make further loans in such case during the 10-year period.

8. Extend and revise the authority under the statute for the compromise, adjustment and reduction of debts for loans being serviced by the agency.

In addition to these recommendations, we made suggestions for further improving our greatly expanded surplus disposal operations, strengthening commodity programs, considering dollar limits on price supports, and carrying out a rural development program.

Now let us turn to the agricultural bill that was passed by the Senate Monday of last week and which you requested me to discuss at this time. It is appropriate that we examine together the various features of the pending legislation (H. R. 12) as it now stands and analyze as best we can its total impact upon American agriculture.

The bill as passed by the Senate has some good features but it also carries a number of provisions which would work to the disadvantage of farmers and tend to defeat the purposes of the soil bank.

The proposed soil bank, with both its acreage reserve and conservation reserve, would move definitely in the direction of reducing agricultural surpluses which are seriously depressing farm income. While some modifications in legislative language may be necessary, this section of the bill is generally good. It will permit a massive assault on the most important factor depressing farm income, the surplus. Together with our stepped up surplus disposal operations farm prices and incomes will be strengthened in the market place.

Some of the other constructive features of the bill as passed by the Senate are:

1. The long needed adjustment in the grade and staple length for parity and supports for upland cotton.

2. Authorization for the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay the cost of processing commodities donated under section 416 into a form suitable for home or institutional use.

3. The provision for a Surplus Disposal Administrator.

4. The exemption from marketing quota penalties of wheat grown and used on the farm where produced.

5. Assistance to the States in tree planting and reforestation.

Now I should like to review some of the provisions of H. R. 12, as it passed the Senate, which we believe are economically unsound and contrary to the best interests of our farmers and our agriculture in general.

I. Increased set-aside: Last minute amendments to the bill which would statistically isolate vast surpluses of corn, cotton and wheat in an effort to boost support price levels would have the effect of aggravating still further the surplus problem.

This device can only move us away from a permanent solution for the farm problem. It merely perpetuates the very system that got us into our present trouble in the first place.

Changing the name or calling a surplus a "set aside" does not wish it out of existence nor does it remove the depressing effect on market prices. Every student of markets recognize and takes into consideration the existence of the burdensome supplies that have resulted from high rigid price supports. For, what one Congress does can be changed by the next. The physical existence remains.

For example, let us take a look at the 1955 corn situation. Market prices have been 40–50 cents under support—$1.58 per bushel (87 percent of parity). Does anyone honestly think that the market price would rise just because the Secretary waved a magic wand and placed a label on 250 million bushels marked "set aside"? Changing the lines on the thermometer does not change the patient's temperature.

Moreover, in the case of cotton, the increase in the set-aside provided for in the bill would curtail CCC's ability to export or otherwise sell any upland cotton. The reason for this is that CCC now owns 6¾ million bales whereas the mandatory minimum set-aside is proposed to be fixed under the bill at 7½ million bales. This would be a serious blow to cotton growers.

You may ask me why I oppose this increase in the set-aside, when the set-aside idea was originally proposed by the administration in the Agricultural Act of 1954.

The differences are these:

We proposed the set-aside as a gradual means of moving to a flexible program; this bill apparently contemplates their use as a means of avoiding such a move.

We proposed to and have in fact been reducing the set-aside; the bill apparently considers them as a more or less permanent way of life.

II. Double standard parity: Prior to the adoption of the new parity definition which became effective in 1950, parity prices were sharply criticized because they retained the same pattern of price relationships that existed in 1910–14. One of the major reasons for adopting the new parity formula was to bring and to keep the pattern of price relationships more nearly up to date.

To avoid sharp adjustments in the parity prices of individual commodities, the law provided that the decline in the parity price of any commodity could not exceed 5 percent of the old parity price. This provision was effective for nonbasic commodities beginning in 1950. The Agricultural Act of 1954 provided for a similar transition provision to become effective on basic commodities in 1956.

The effect of continuing the use of old or new parity, whichever is higher, for basic commodities is acceptance of the new parity formula when it results in a higher parity price and rejection when it results in a lower parity price. This provides more generous treatment for basic commodities than for the nonbasics.

Making the parity price the result of whichever of two alternative calculations gives the higher answer raises serious questions about the whole parity concept. If the new parity formula is an improvement over the old formula, it should be accepted for all commodities. If it is not an improvement, it should be rejected for all commodities.

If modernized parity is right for rice, soybeans, hogs, apples, lemons, potatoes, and 150 other commodities, why isn't it right for wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts? If it is right for commodities covering 80 percent of the gross receipts, why is it wrong for the other 20 percent?

The shift proposed in the bill would boost parity prices, mainly for peanuts, wheat, and corn. To the extent that we artifically raise prices we will stimulate over production, reduce consumption, increase stocks, and lower free market prices.

This dual approach destroys the very usefulness of the parity concept itself. It abandons parity as a principle. It places in the hands of enemies of all price support a potent weapon which they would not hesitate to use.

III. Higher dairy price supports: The dairy business in 1955 was much improved over 1954. Not everything is as we would like it, true enough. But real progress is being made, production and consumption are coming into better balance. During the past year:

	Percent
Number of milk cows decreased	1
Consumption of milk increased	5
Per capita consumption of butter increased	2
Milk prices increased	1
Feed prices declined	7
Farm income from the sale of milk increased	2

Stocks of CCC-owned butter, which stood at 466 million pounds in 1954, are now virtually all committed. We are out of butter. I hasten to add that we have substantial stocks of cheese, and that our low inventory of dairy products has been achieved through sales at less than cost and through a sizable donation program. Realized cost of the dairy program in the last year of record was $440 million.

Government purchases have dropped. In the marketing year 1953–54, dairy products in the equivalent of 11 billion pounds of milk were acquired. In 1954–55 the figure was 5.7 billion pounds in 1955–56 purchases of surplus-dairy products will be the equivalent of about 5 billion pounds of milk.

The dairy industry has greatly increased its promotional expenditures designed to increase milk consumption, and there is excellent cooperation all along the line. These efforts are paying off in increased sales of dairy products and expanded consumption.

Now comes this bill with a provision that turns us back toward the dark days of 1953 and 1954.

An arbitrary period of time is taken by selecting a high-base period. It does violence to the parity concept as normally considered. It will freeze forever a parity equivalent relationship which existed for a short time 7 years ago and which is already badly out of date.

It will discourage the dairy industry from its valiant effort to promote consumption of dairy products. Why try to sell milk in the commercial market when Uncle Sam stands ready to pay more than the trade will pay?

The results of enacting this provision might seem advantageous on the surface, but underneath dairymen will recognize the same old siren song that led their ship onto the rocks before.

IV. Domestic parity plan for wheat: We have spent considerable time reviewing the pros and cons of this part of the legislation. As I indicated in a meeting with representatives of wheat producers, I stood ready to reexamine the proposed plan with its new features. Just yesterday, this whole subject was reviewed for the fourth time, by the National Agricultural Advisory Commission. The Commission, which has had a changing composition during the past 3 years, turned down the domestic parity plan decisively in each instance. There is serious question whether this proposal will accomplish the objectives its sponsors seek.

Our analysis indicates that:

1. It will hurt the small wheat grower. Under the present program any farmer can produce up to 15 acres of wheat without marketing quota penalties. Any farmer may do this even though he exceeds his acreage allotment. Therefore, these small wheat producers are in a position to obtain substantial benefits from the operation of the present price-support program since they can sell all their production in a market protected by the price-support level.

Contrast this with the effects on the producer under the domestic parity plan. If a farmer has no allotment he will be forced to sell all his production at a feed price which will be very substantially less than the current support price.

Let us take the example of a farmer in the commercial wheat area with a 3-acre allotment and a 25-bushel yield. Under the present program he can produce 15 acres of wheat without penalty. This would give him a production of 375 bushels which he can sell at close to the support level, $1.81 per bushel.

This same farmer under the domestic parity scheme would receive the domestic parity level on 37 bushels, and the balance of 338 bushels would have to be sold at a price comparable to feed price, $1.40 per bushel. Thus the small farmer would lose in income about $100 from what he otherwise would receive with the present program in effect.

The proposed certificate plan for wheat would be costly indeed to the small wheat grower. It should be remembered that almost two-thirds of the wheat farms in the United States have allotments of 15 acres or less. In some States this runs above 90 percent. Here are the figures for certain States: Ohio, 82 percent of the wheat growers produce less than 15 acres. In Indiana, it is 80 percent; Michigan, 85 percent; New York, 84 percent; Kansas, 24 percent; North Dakota, 4 percent; Washington, 37 percent; and Oregon, 59 percent.

2. Small farmers will be disenfranchised. Under the present marketing quota program any farmer in the commercial wheat area who intends to harvest more than 15 acres of wheat is eligible to vote. All wheat producers outside the commercial area are not subject to the quotas. They do not vote because they are not subject to quotas.

Under the proposed certificate plan, all wheat producers—large and small, no matter where located—would be directly affected by the plan. And yet, not all these producers—only those in the commercial area who intend to harvest more than 15 acres of wheat—would be eligible to vote. This would be only about 35 percent of all the farmers who grow wheat.

This means that all the small farmers who now have the opportunity to plant up to 15 acres of wheat without marketing quota penalties will not be in a position to vote in the referendum on the certificate plan even though it directly affects every one of them.

Thus, on a plan that so seriously affects the welfare of about two-thirds of the wheat farmers in the United States their voice will not be heard. This legislation definitely disenfranchises the small wheat producer. In this connection it should also be noted that feed-grain producers who will be adversely affected by this legislation would not be eligible to vote unless they had wheat allotments of more than 15 acres.

3. The proposed certificate plan for wheat will result in lower prices for other feed

grains. Feed grain prices would drop by at least 2 percent. CCC would acquire the equivalent in other feed grains of about 50 percent of the additional wheat fed. Thus to the diverted acre problem is added the feed wheat problem for the cash grain producer.

4. Exports would not increase under the certificate proposal. We probably would still have price-support loans at above the world free market level for wheat. Therefore, CCC would still acquire wheat under the support program and we would need all the present Government programs such as Public Law 480, barter, ICA, IWA, and others to maintain the current level of exports. There would be no advantage for us to engage in a price war since importing countries would probably go on a hand-to-mouth basis anyhow.

5. It should be well understood that with a certificate plan there would be need for even more controls. Under the proposal allotments and price-support operations would continue to be authorized. The only additional feature is the domestic market certificate.

6. The cost of present farm programs is borne by taxation, according to income. Under this plan, the cost is borne according to consumption.

7. There would be demands from other commodity groups for price fixing of the domestically consumed portion of their crop.

8. The proposal permits one segment of our population to vote a program on themselves without others, who may be adversely affected, having opportunity to participate in the referendum.

V. Certificate plan for rice: It is generally recognized that our rice industry is now confronted with very serious surplus supply and production problems. The acreage has been reduced from 2.6 million in 1954 to 1.6 million acres in 1956. We in the Department of Agriculture, and I am confident that the Members of the House and Senate, want to see legislation enacted which is best for the long-time interest of our rice producers and the American people. The bill as passed by the Senate contains a provision for a certificate plan for rice. I am sure that if this provision did not meet the long-time interest of our rice producers and the American people, its sponsors would not want this legislation in the pending bill.

How would this proposed certificate plan for rice operate?

I. Producers would receive marketing certificates. The total amount of such certificates would equal the estimated consumption of rice in the primary market. Please note that under this proposal the primary market includes the United States possessions and Cuba. By means of these certificates, each producer would be allotted shares of the primary market based on a proportion of his normal production from his allotted acreage. The value of these certificates per hundredweight of rice would equal 35 percent of parity in 1956 and probably 40 percent of parity after 1956.

2. Processors would be required to purchase certificates for all rough rice milled.

3. A support price of 55 percent of parity would be made available for 1956, and probably 50 percent of parity in other years.

The separation of the primary market (which includes exports to Cuba) from the export market, as provided by the bill as passed by the Senate, would have serious economic, administrative, and international impacts. While I am sure that this type of legislation would not be without some advantages, it seems to me that on balance the disadvantages far outweigh the advantages.

Let us examine some of the disadvantages of this type of legislation.

1. Tremendous problems of enforcement would be encountered. One of the serious problems would be to prevent purchases for the secondary export market from finding their way into domestic consumption and exports to Cuba. Certainly this bill does not permit us to control imports into Cuba. If Cuban millers should so desire they could purchase rough rice in the United States at a very low price and mill this rice in Cuba. Thus, what many proponents of this legislation consider as a part of a primary market could be taken from the American producers in the form of sales at secondary market prices. Also, the American mills could lose the business of milling rice.

Let us examine another loophole in this proposal which depends so strongly on including Cuba in the primary market. Let us assume for a minute that a domestic mill has milled rice and has exported it to the Bahamas. The domestic miller would receive a refund for the milled rice exported. The purchaser in the Bahamas could then without even unloading the vessel transship the rice into Cuba. If the Cuban market is maintained at a high level, this United States-produced rice would move into Cuba at a profit to the transshipper, unless Cuban licensing and restrictions could prevent this.

Altogether, it seems to me that there are too many loopholes. Without the unilateral inclusion of Cuba in this program it cannot succeed.

2. Section 380 (c) relating to the establishment of the rice primary market quota requires the Secretary to make this determination at least 7 months prior to the start of the marketing season. While the experts tell me it is not too difficult to estimate the domestic requirements, the estimate of exports to Cuba so far in advance, especially when we are selling to Cuba at much above competitive levels, would be extremely difficult.

This increases the chance for error, a factor which is present even on estimates made just prior to the start of the marketing season. Also, there is no provision for adjusting the primary marketing quota upward once the determination is made.

3. The announcement of such a program could result in a virtual cessation of exports to non-Cuban areas after passage of the bill until August 1, 1956, unless a provision is made for a special subsidy since anyone who could defer purchases would do so in order to obtain rice at a lower market price.

4. The requirement of section 380 (h) that CCC make refund payments to owners of rough rice on July 31, 1956, equal to 35 percent of parity as of August 1, 1956, would result in windfalls to such processors for this reason:

(a) The support price in 1955 averaged only 86 percent of parity and on January 1, 1956, the farm price averaged 82 percent of parity. A refund of 35 percent of parity would result in a net price of 47 percent of parity, as against a new support for 1956 of 55 percent of parity. This procedure could provide an 8-percent windfall.

5. This type of program appears to be in violation of article I of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. It violates the principle of the most-favored-nation clause. It is, in effect, a United States tax on Cuban consumers. Certainly Cuba would prefer to collect its own taxes rather than turn them over to the United States rice producer.

6. The higher we force Cuban prices the greater their incentive to increase production. The certificate plan would put United States rice at a disadvantage in the Cuban market, where it now enjoys a preference. We stand to lose the Cuban market.

In summary, I would like to point out that the rice certificate plan in the bill provides for more rather than less Government controls than are provided under the present program. The certificate plan would still retain acreage allotments, loans, and penalize farmers for overplanting. The new complication would be in the form of processing certificates. The impact on international relations should not be overlooked. We would probably be accused of dumping, and countries would retaliate by price competition or discrimination against the imports of American agricultural and manufactured products. For the above reasons it seems to me that the certificate plan for rice included in the pending bill is not in the best interest of rice producers and the American people.

VI. Compulsory price supports on feed grains: This provision will make thousands of farmers ineligible for 1956 price support. In areas such as the heavy grain sorghum area of Texas which expanded markedly in 1954 and 1955, limiting the acreage to the 3-year average may require farmers to cut back sharply if they are to be eligible for price support.

In addition, and most important of all, it sets up a system of price support relationships which defies logic. It goes on the theory that distance from a market has no effect on price. It discards all previous concepts of price relationships for the feed grains.

Adjoining farms would have price supports that differed as much as 25 percent from one another, where previously there had been no differences. Discretionary supports, which have been in effect up to now, have worked well. The provision in the Senate bill would move oats, barley, and sorghum into the group of problem commodities. They would move into Government warehouses and not into consumption. And a Government warehouse is not a market.

Also it would add a whole series of new Government controls on feed grain producers.

VII. Processor's certification on prices paid producer: This provision requires the Secretary, when conducting any support or surplus removal program through purchases, to obtain a certification from the processor that the producer was paid not less than the support price or, in the absence of a support price, a fair price determined and publicly announced by the Secretary.

This provision is impossible of administration. It would be ineffective and tend to defeat its purpose. It would cause widespread dissatisfaction among producers.

Processed products purchased by the Department in many cases are processed from milk, live animals, fruits and vegetables received from many producers. Prices paid to individual producers vary substantially by seasons, location, quality, age, class, or variety, as well as hauling and other services performed. It generally would be impracticable to make equitable adjustments for these factors in support prices or in fair prices required to be named. Also in many cases the commodities sold by farmers move through several hands before they are processed and sold to the Government.

Also, it would deny the direct benefits of support to those farmers whose only outlets are processors who could not or would not certify that they had paid the specified prices and who would sell their processed products in the commercial market instead of to the Government. The provision could result in lower prices to those farmers and cause widespread dissatisfaction among such farmers.

There are other provisions in both the Senate and House versions of H. R. 12 which are subject to question. For example, it will be extremely difficult in view of the requirements for annual appropriations to make long-term contracts under the conservation reserve program.

The Department of Agriculture will be happy to provide additional information if requested by the conferees. We shall be glad to provide an item by item summary of our position and the major reasons therefor. Our interest is that a sound bill be hammered out in conference, that this be done speedily and that the bill be quickly passed by both Houses in such shape that it can be signed by the President.